DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 754 IR 052 470

AUTHOR Lynch, Mary Jo
TITLE A Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Final Report on a Pilot Project.
INSTITUTION American Library Association, Chicago, IL. Office of Research.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ALA-87-3123k
PUB DATE 28 Aug 87
CONTRACT 300-85-0191
NOTE 128p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Data Collection; Library Research; *Library Statistics; Microcomputers; *National Programs; Pilot Projects; *Public Libraries; Research Design; State Libraries; *State Surveys; *Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS *Center for Education Statistics; Machine Readable Data Files

ABSTRACT

This report describes a pilot project to develop a Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection, which would enable the Center for Education Statistics (CES) of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to issue national statistical reports on public libraries by using data collected by state library agencies in their annual surveys. Begun in 1985, the pilot project was an attempt to start the cooperative system by working with a small number of states. Twenty states initially responded to a letter sent to the chief officer in each state library agency explaining the project and inviting participation. Of these, 17 worked actively with the project for many months, and 15 were committed to sending data in 1986; 13 other states have expressed an interest in joining the system in the future. All states are sending data in IBM compatible, machine-readable form, and a standard record layout has been prepared for use by all participants. At the time of this report, CES had successfully transferred data sent by four states to the mainframe and begun analysis. This report also summarizes previous efforts at coordinating state and federal data collection from public libraries, explains what was proposed and what was done in the pilot project, and makes suggestions for the future regarding the timing, management, and content issues that need to be settled before the cooperative system is fully operational. The text is supplemented by 27 attachments, consisting of documents and correspondence which illustrate the process used and the items discussed. (12 bibliographic references) (EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297754

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SEP 3 1987

87-3123k

A Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Final Report on a Pilot Project

Prepared under contract to the U.S. Department of Education
Contract Number: 300-85-0191

by

Mary Jo Lynch, Director
American Library Association, Office for Research

August 28, 1987

IR052470

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

87-3123k

A Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Final Report on a Pilot Project

Prepared under contract to the U.S. Department of Education
Contract Number: 300-85-0191

by

Mary Jo Lynch, Director
American Library Association, Office for Research

August 28, 1987

Prepared for the Center for Education Statistics and Library Programs in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement under contract 300-85-0191. Contractors undertaking such projects are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. This report, therefore, does not necessarily represent positions on policies of the Government, and no official endorsement should be inferred. This report is released as received from the contractor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments (3)

Executive Summary (4)

I. Background

A. Federal Data Collection (5)
B. State Data Collection (5)
C. Federal & State Cooperation Regarding Public Library Statistics (6)

II. Pilot Project Proposal (7)

A. At the State Level (7)
B. At NCES (8)
C. In the Library Community (8)

III. Plan of Work and Work Done (8)

A. Phase One - State Library Agencies (8)
B. Phase Two - NCES (12)
C. Phase Three - The Library Community (13)
D. Additional Work Done (15)

IV. Results of the Pilot Project (16)

A. Number of Participants (16)
B. Form of Participation (17)
C. The Multi-State Report (17)
D. Potential for a 50-State System (17)

V. Suggestions for the Future (17)

A. Expansion Phase (17)
B. Operational Phase (18)

1. Timing (18)

2. Management (19)

3. Content (19)

VI. Conclusion (25)

VII. References (26)

VIII. Advisory Committee (27)

IX. Attachments (28)

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank many people who worked hard to make this project a success. The Advisory Committee (see Part VIII) was outstanding in their creativity, generosity, and commitment to the project. Yvonne Carter of the Library Program Office and Dr. Samuel Peng of the Center for Education Statistics were always available to give helpful guidance. State librarians and persons responsible for statistics in participating states were extremely cooperative. Richard Palmer, Deputy State Librarian of Ohio, deserves special mention for distributing a model record layout on paper and disk. Dr. Philip Clark of St. Johns University gave advice gratis on many occasions in addition to serving as a paid consultant. To all of them mentioned and to others who helped the pilot project in various ways, I want to express thanks for myself and for future beneficiaries of the Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection.

Executive Summary

In November, 1984 the ALA Office for Research (OFR) submitted a report to the Office of Education which suggested that a Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection be established. The Cooperative System would enable the Center for Education Statistics to issue national statistical reports on public libraries by using data collected by state library agencies in their annual surveys. This is the report of a pilot project that attempted to start the Cooperative System by working with a small group of states. The pilot project began in September, 1985 when a letter was sent to the chief officer in each state library agency explaining the project and inviting participation. Twenty states responded initially, seventeen worked actively with the project for some or many months, fifteen are committed to sending fiscal year 1986 data to CES as this report is being written, five have already done so. Thirteen states have expressed interest in joining the system in the future.

Most participating states sent one or two persons to a workshop in March, 1986. All participants used the lists of Items and Instructions sent out after the Workshop to modify their own state statistics forms so that all Items are included and data are collected in accordance with the Instructions.

All states are sending data in IBM compatible, machine-readable form. A standard record layout was prepared for use by all participants. Most are using Lotus 1-2-3 and sending floppy disks. At this time, CES has successfully transferred data sent by four states to the mainframe and begun analysis.

This report summarizes previous efforts at coordinating state and federal data collection from public libraries, explains what was proposed and what was done in the pilot project, and makes suggestions for the future regarding the timing, management, and content issues that need to be settled before the Cooperative System is fully operational.

A Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Final Report on A Pilot Project

I. Background

A. Federal Data Collection.

1. 1870-1985: Since 1870, some unit of the federal government has collected statistics from various types of libraries. From 1965 until 1985, that unit was the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). In the later years of this period, all library surveys, including public library surveys, were conducted under contract to the Multilevel Statistics Branch of NCES.

   Numerous public library surveys were done between 1870 and 1985, the latest in the fall of 1982. NCES library surveys in the period 1972-82 are described in Sources of Library Statistics 1972-1982.[1] Earlier work is described in J. C. Rather's An Annotated Bibliography of Recurring Surveys.[2]

2. 1985 to date: In Secretary Bennett's 1985 reorganization of the Department of Education, NCES became the Center for Statistics, one of five units in the Office for Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). In the fall of 1987, Congress ordered that the name of the unit be changed to Center for Education Statistics (CES). Library surveys are no longer concentrated in a single Branch, but are assigned to divisions as appropriate (e.g., the Postsecondary Education Statistics Division of CES will do a periodic survey of college and university libraries as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)).

B. State Data Collection.

The work of the state library agencies collecting statistics from public libraries was described almost ten years ago in two independent studies:

1. Herbert Goldhor, "Library Statistics for 1974 Published by State and Provincial Library Agencies" in the 1978 Bowker Annual.[3] This report focused mainly on statistics of public libraries and was based on an analysis of compilations of data from 44 states. Table A, which covers public libraries, shows which state reports include data on each of 67 variables. Full citations are given to the state reports used.

2. Kenneth Shearer, ed., The Collection and Use of Public Library Statistics by State Agencies: A Compilation of Forms.[4] This two-inch-thick publication consists primarily of forms collected from state library agencies by LAMA's Statistics for Public Libraries Committee. Although this information is probably of little use today since many states have revised their forms, two other parts of the work are still valuable: a 30 page analysis by Kenneth Shearer and

tables compiled by David Nickell, then a student of Shearer's at North Carolina Central University, showing which data are collected and how data are arranged in state reports. Shearer's analysis summarizes earlier literature on the subject of state collection of statistics from public libraries and comments on how states collect, report, and use data. Nickell's tables show how data are arranged in each state report (e.g., cities ranked by size of population, cities arranged by county), what broad topics are covered (e.g., holdings, income), and what special features are included in the report (e.g., maps, graphics).

C. Federal and State Cooperation on Public Library Statistics.

1. 1966-1973: ALA and NCES together try to establish LIBGIS.

The idea of federal and state cooperation in the collection of statistics from all types of libraries goes back at least as far as the late 1960's. Two documents published in 1970 contain statements on this subject. ALA's Standards for Library Functions at the State Level (Chicago: ALA, 1970) specifies that: "The annual statistics gathered by the individual states should be designed to provide a common core of data among States and for the nation."[5] This statement was quoted by S. Gilbert Prentiss, former New York State Librarian, in his paper for Planning for a Nationwide System of Library Statistics, the final report on a project completed by ALA under contract to the U.S. Office of Education. Two of the nine recommendations of this report touch on the issue of state participation in national data collection. Those recommendations are:

> A program of shared responsibility between NCES and the States in nationwide (as well as State) library statistical coverage is essential and should be highly defined, coordinated, and regularized. NCES will have to take a close look at the library functions at the State level to determine which agencies are responsible for which functions.
>
> Federal financial assistance to the States to enable them to carry out their responsibilities in the foregoing system is mandatory. This assistance should be designed to both stimulate State investment in this area and to be used as a tool for regularization and compliance.[6]

One attempt to implement those recommendations was made in the early 1970's by the Illinois State Library under contract to the U.S. Office of Education. The "Library General Information Survey (LIBGIS) State Participation and Development" project was an attempt to develop a core form to be used in collecting comparable data simultaneously from all types of libraries and a model form for collecting data unique to each type. These data collection forms would be administered by state library agencies. In the final report of the project, Alphonse Trezza and Barbara Slanker document what was done in great detail and summarize ten "unresolved problems".[7] Many of those problems still exist today, such as the need for rapid publication of data gathered, the controversy over what items to include on the forms and the need for analysis and interpretation of data. The project was ultimately unsuccessful, perhaps because those problems remained unsolved.

It is important to note, also, that the LIBGIS project sought to coordinate statistics from all types of libraries, not just public and that it proposed a new system rather than a system built on existing data collection practices in the states. The pilot project described in this report is different on both points. In addition, the pilot project uses microcomputer technology to manage data--something that was not possible in the LIBGIS project.

2. 1983-1984: ALA Office for Research (OFR) prepares "Analysis of Library Data Collection and Development of Plans for the Future."[8]

In November, 1984, the ALA Office for Research completed a contract for NCES with the report cited above. This report described the collection of statistics by state government agencies from academic, public, and school libraries and included recommended forms and definitions to be used by NCES in collecting statistics from each type of library. The narrative report was supplemented by a three volume appendix made up of tables showing, for each type of library, what items appear on the form for each state.

The strongest recommendation of the report was based on the finding that all 50 states collect statistics annually from public libraries. The report suggested that the collection of annual statistical data from public libraries by the states be coordinated with the periodic reporting of national data by NCES. It was suggested that if states would agree on a common set of data items to be used on their forms and would also agree to send results to NCES, the data could be aggregated by NCES into a national report.

Before making this recommendation, the Principal Investigator asked the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA) to endorse it in principle. The endorsement was granted.

II. The Pilot Project Proposal

Immediately after the above mentioned report was filed, the ALA Office for Research began work on an Unsolicited Proposal to NCES entitled "The Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: A Pilot Project."[9] This proposal outlined a plan for beginning to implement the idea suggested in the November, 1984 report by working with a small group of states to solve several problems which the proposal described as follows.

A. At the State level: The recently completed ALA project showed that although there is considerable agreement as to what general topics should be on the annual public library survey forms, there is considerable disagreement regarding specific items. If data are to be comparable from state to state, however, this variety must be reduced. To do so will require considerable effort by the states. In addition, there are several incompatibilities which are not primarily linguistic but are the result of state law, regulations, or fiscal practices. These problems must be resolved. COSLA is willing to cooperate, but COSLA is not an operational agency. Some other organization must coordinate cooperative activities and give technical assistance to the states.

B. At NCES: The proposed system is different from the data collection activities previously directed by NCES. Instead of contracting with a firm to mail survey forms to a sample of libraries, tabulate responses, and prepare a report, NCES will need to design a method for gathering reports from the states and aggregating them. Questions will have to be resolved regarding such things as timing (states have different fiscal years), format, items, and definitions. Although the proposed system will ultimately save NCES time and money, the establishment of the system will require an expenditure of both.

C. In the library community: Although librarians want to have statistics showing national trends when asked for them by governmental officials or when such statistics are needed for local planning, survey forms from any source are often considered a nuisance. Considerable work must be done to convince librarians that they will gain enough benefits from this cooperative system that prompt and complete returns are worth the effort.

To solve these problems the proposal suggested that the cooperative system for public library data collection be operationalized through a project sponsored by the Department of Education and conducted by ALA, an organization knowledgeable about both NCES and the states and in touch with major organizations related to public libraries. Furthermore, because of the existing variety in current state forms and data collection practices the proposal suggested that a pilot project be done with a small group of states before an attempt is made to achieve cooperation with all fifty. The pilot project would attempt to solve the problems noted above and establish the cooperative system for public library data collection on a sound footing. The proposal specified a plan of work which is described in the following section of this report along with description of what was actually done and accomplished during the pilot project.

III. Plan of Work

Note: The work actually done varied from what was anticipated in the original proposal. This section quotes the text describing each activity in the proposal and then explains what was actually done. Since the name of NCES changed after the proposal was written, the WORK DONE sections which follow will use the current name (CES) while the quoted material will refer to NCES.

A. Phase One - State Library Agencies

1. Proposal: "Identify a group of four to six states by asking for volunteers who are willing to participate in a pilot project which will implement the idea of a cooperative public library data collection system."

WORK DONE: As soon as the contract was signed, letters were sent to the chief officers of all 50 state library agencies describing the project and inviting participation (Attachment 1). Over twenty states volunteered to be participants although several had to withdraw eventually. When the Advisory Committee met in November 1985, it was decided to involve as many states as wanted to be part of the pilot. This decision meant a major restructuring of the project

as there would be more states at the workshop and more states to contact by mail and by phone. It turned out to be a very wise decision for several reasons, among them the fact that some states had to withdraw from the pilot after participating for some time and the fact that having a large number of states involved has attracted other states who want to join the system at a later date.

2. Proposal: "Ask the selected states for a critique of the form recommended to NCES in terms of how data items and definitions would be incorporated into their annual survey."

3. Proposal: "Consider these critiques of the form and work with the states to determine whether changes should be made in the items and definitions recommended by NCES."

WORK DONE: It was assumed that the work described in I. C.2. above would serve as a solid base for the pilot project. Therefore, it would not be necessary to create the cooperative system from scratch. Instead, the form and instructions recommended to NCES in the November 1984 report for use in their next national survey of public libraries would be considered by the Advisory Committee and participating states and modified as appropriate. Activities 2 and 3 were intended to achieve that. In reality, agreement on what data states would collect for FY86 was achieved as described in a-d below. Although four versions of the lists of Items and Instructions were issued in the course of this project, only the last two versions are attached. Attachments 2 and 3 were used for FY86 data collection and Attachments 4 and 5 have been proposed for FY87.

a. In October 1984, a letter was sent to the chief officer of each state library agency informing him/her that Mary Jo Lynch would be at the October COSLA meeting to ask for COSLA's endorsement of the concept of a cooperative data collection project. Enclosed were copies of the form and instructions that would be included in the Final Report of the project described in I. C.2. above. Critiques were received from eleven states. Once the pilot project was funded and the Advisory Committee appointed, those critiques were summarized in a memo of October 24, 1985, sent to the Advisory Committee as matter for discussion at their November 7-8, 1985, meeting (see Attachment 8).

b. At the November 7-8 meeting of the pilot project Advisory Committee there was considerable discussion of items to be collected in the Cooperative System. The Principal Investigator used notes from the discussions on November 7-8 to create draft lists of Items and Instructions which were shared with the Advisory Committee and discussed with the Committee in a conference call. A "final" version dated December 4, 1985, was distributed to participating states on January 6, 1986. At the time it was believed that these Items and Instructions would not be modified until after the pilot project.

c. In early 1986, critiques of the 12-4-85 lists were received from three states. These critiques were shared with the Advisory Committee (see Attachments 7 and 8).

d. Additional comments on the Items and Instructions were received at the March 1986 Workshop. The agenda allowed time for such discussion, and several participants asked to spend additional time on this topic during a time scheduled for optional small group. During the workshop the Principal Investigator told participants that no change would be made until the full Advisory Committee had considered it. Since only three Advisory Committee members were at the Workshop, this could not happen until after the Workshop was finished. Immediately after the Workshop, the Principal Investigator summarized the proposed changes in a memo to the Advisory Committee (see Attachment 9). After a conference call on March 21, 1986, the Items and Instructions were again revised and duplicated with a date of March 25, 1986 (see Attachments 2 and 3).

No additional changes were made for pilot project data collection (i.e., Fiscal 1986), but the Principal Investigator continued to collect comments on the items and instructions. This additional commentary was considered by the Advisory Committee at their Midwinter 1987 meeting, and revised lists of Items and Instructions were prepared for distribution to participants and potential participants (see Attachments 4 and 5). States already participating also received a memo explaining why each change was made (see Attachment 10).

4. Proposal: "Discuss with participating state agencies the suggestions for use of microcomputers to collect and disseminate statistics made by technical consultant to ALA/NCES project."

WORK DONE: When the pilot project was proposed, it was known that several states were using microcomputers to manage various types of statistics about public libraries. At the March 1986 Workshop, participants were asked to indicate their use of computers by filling in a form. Results were summarized and sent to the Advisory Committee and participants. Once we saw what hardware and software states were using, we began to explore ways to ease the burden on NCES by ensuring that states using similar systems sent similar machine-readable data. Gail McKenzie, then Library Statistics Coordinator at the Indiana State Library, prepared a record layout for those using mainframes and shared it with Oklahoma and Pennsylvania. Richard Palmer, Deputy State Librarian in Ohio, had his staff prepare a record layout for use with Lotus 1-2-3 and shared it with those who had indicated that they would use Lotus. Both a paper copy and a template on a disk were provided by the Ohio State Library. As the project developed, additional states became interested in using Lotus 1-2-3.

The state of California presented several challenges. For one thing, California did not use an IBM compatible microcomputer to manage public library statistics. Also, they were not able to key data needed by the cooperative system but not needed in California--about 50% of the items on the form. We planned to solve the problem as follows: California would convert their data into ASCII format and send a disk to Dr. Philip Clark, Associate Professor, School of Library & Information Science, St. John's University and author of several articles and books on microcomputer spreadsheets. Also to be sent to Clark were the forms containing additional data items. Clark planned to convert the California data into a Lotus file and supervise the entry of additional items from the California forms.

These plans were not entirely successful. Although the California data was successfully converted to ASCII and then to Lotus, it proved to be easier to enter all data rather than to add items. This was done under Clark's direction, and the resulting Lotus file was sent to CES.

5. Proposal: "Plan and conduct a workshop for persons in participating state library agencies with responsibility for collecting public library statistics. The workshop will cover such topics as how to implement change, items and definitions proposed by NCES, ensuring accurate data from respondents, interviewing respondents about suspect data, designing forms, using microcomputers. The workshop will be held in a city convenient to the majority of participants."

WORK DONE: The workshop was held in Chicago on March 13 and 14, 1986. The following attachments provide additional detail:

-Agenda (see Attachment 11)
-Proceedings (see Attachment 12)

6. Proposal: "Visit participating state library agencies to provide technical assistance with making changes in their forms and procedures."

WORK DONE: Visits to the participating state library agencies were not necessary although there was considerable communication by telephone. Funds originally allocated for this travel were used to cover participation by additional states in the Workshop and a six-months extension of the contract. The proposal did not mention the possibility that states would need advice on using a microcomputer to manage public library data. This advice was needed and was provided by the pilot project participants and by Dr. Philip Clark, working as a consultant to the pilot project.

7. Proposal: "Communicate with participating state library agencies regarding schedule for reporting to NCES, etc."

8. Proposal: "Facilitate communication between states and NCES regarding reporting of data and dissemination of results."

WORK DONE:

a. Reporting of Data.

When the proposal was written, both the timing and the content of the system were unclear. Although it was assumed that OFR would assist NCES and the states in communicating, these activities were described in vague terms. What actually happened was this: during the early months of the contract--September 1985 through March 1986--the content of the system was designed and information was gathered about when states could report and what format could be used. CES allowed OFR a free hand in working with the states to find out what was possible with regard to inclusion of items, timing of surveys, and format for reporting (except that machine-readable files must be IBM compatible). OFR consulted with Sam Peng regularly, mostly by letter or by telephone. When Peng's advice was needed by the states, that advice was communicated by the Principal Investigator either by memo or by phone. At the March, 1986 Workshop states were asked to indicate when the Center would receive FY86 statistics by giving both the "earliest date" and the "most likely date." A list was prepared and has been revised several times since then (see Attachment 13).

It should be noted that many states did not meet the "most likely" date given in Attachment 13. When asked why, several explained that they had never examined carefully the data libraries sent each year. Because they were part of this pilot, however, they did examine the 1986 data and discovered numerous inconsistencies that had to be resolved. These comments revealed an unexpected side benefit of the pilot project--state statistical reports will be more accurate because of the national system and, therefore, of more use at the local level.

Once the schedule was established, OFR kept in touch with the states regarding any problems they might be having and provided advice as appropriate. In several cases, Dr. Philip Clark was asked to act as technical consultant (by phone) to a state needing help with software. Meetings for participating states and interested others were held at each Midwinter and Annual Conference of ALA to facilitate sharing of information (see Attachment 14).

b. Dissemination of results.

The Advisory Committee has considered the content of the aggregate data report at several meetings, and minutes of those meetings have been shared with NCES. Although the contract ends in August 1987 and the data report cannot be compiled until early 1988 when data have been received from all fifteen states expected to report as of this writing, OFR will continue to work with the Center regarding reporting of data and dissemination of results. An unsolicited proposal to support this work and other activities will be submitted in September 1987.

B. Phase Two - NCES

1. Proposal: "Interview staff of Multilevel Statistics Branch regarding problems they anticipate with the cooperative system and questions they have about the independent data collection efforts they will be blending into one report."

WORK DONE: We had several interviews with Dr. Samuel Peng, Director of the Postsecondary Education Statistics Division, both in person and by telephone. He reviewed the record layouts described above and provided other advice as needed. In August 1987, Peng's staff successfully transferred data from microcomputer disks sent by four states to the CES mainframe. After this was done, Peng asked that states be reminded to follow the model formats exactly. When we explored the reasons why states deviated from the model formats, we found that several objected to two matters: the use of 9's in all spaces of a field to signify missing data and the coding of each data item as real(1) or an estimate(2). After discussing the problem with Sam Peng and several others, we omitted those requirements as explained in a memo to participants (see Attachment 15).

During July and August, 1987, the pilot project received an unexpected assist from Dr. Robert Molyneux of the University of Illinois, an expert on library statistics who had a summer appointment in the Library Programs Office to investigate the state of library statistics. Molyneux conducted some

exploratory data analysis on data from the first four states and found that the data were remarkably free of the "odd" numbers often seen when data are collected for the first time.

2. Proposal: "Develop solutions to problems identified above and discuss possible solutions with participating state library agencies."

3. Proposal: "Draft instructions for NCES to send to states regarding such items as:

   · time of data collection

   · format of data sent to NCES"

WORK DONE: When this proposal was written, it was not yet decided that states would report at the end of a fiscal year whenever that year ends. Once that decision was made, the timing of reports was up to the states and instructions would be inappropriate. Regarding format, CES required only that it be IBM compatible. Most states are sending microcomputer disks using Lotus 1-2-3.

4. Proposal: "Work with NCES to expedite gathering of data collected by states, merging it into a single report, and publishing results."

WORK DONE: OFR has asked states when they would report to CES, set up a schedule (see Attachment 13), and called states periodically to find out what was happening (see Attachment 16). Merging data and publishing a report from all states will be done in early 1988. Preliminary analysis is underway now at CES under the direction of Larry La Moure who intends to publish "early estimates" in the next few months.

C. Phase Three - Library Community

1. Proposal: "Conduct meetings of National Advisory Committee (1-1-1/2 days in Chicago early in the project, a short meeting at the 1985 Annual Conference (June) and at the Midwinter meeting in January 1986."

WORK DONE: Since the project started at a different time than what was originally anticipated, these dates were changed. The Advisory Committee met in November 1985 (see Attachments 17 and 18), at the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 1986, at the ALA Annual Conference in June 1986, and at the 1987 Midwinter Meeting, and the 1987 Annual Conference. In addition, the committee has held several conference calls and individual members have been consulted on numerous occasions. The committee has really functioned not as liaison with the library community as placement in Phase III implies, but as a source of invaluable advice to the principal investigator. At the first meeting in November 1985, for example, the Advisory Committee made several decisions that were of major importance to the future of the project. Those decisions were:

1. Instead of five or six, accept all who volunteer.

2. Multi-state report should be for a single fiscal year, and states should send data as soon as possible after that fiscal year ends in a particular state.

3. Project will give states a list of items to be incorporated into state forms and instructions on how terms are defined--NOT a form to be filled in.

4. State library agency staff will be responsible for the quality of data from libraries in the state.

5. Population served by each library will be the population of the legal service area and will be reported by the state library agency.

6. Form and instructions included in the November 1984 "Analysis of Library Data Collection" report were revised for use in the cooperative system.

Several weeks after that meeting, the Advisory Committee reviewed a revision of the items/instructions and participated in a conference call to resolve discrepancies.

At ALA's 1986 Midwinter Meeting, the Advisory Committee discussed preliminary plans for the March Workshop, plans for publicizing the pilot project, and preliminary specifications for the aggregate data report (see Attachment 19). In February and March, they received memos from the Principal Investigator about questions raised by pilot project states (see Attachments 7 and 8) and provided advice by telephone. Several members of the Advisory Committee made presentations at the March 1986 Workshop, and all participated in correspondence and a conference call to discuss revisions of the Items and Instructions lists based on suggestions made at the workshop. At the 1986 Annual Conference, the Advisory Committee met to discuss in detail what should be included in the aggregate report (see Attachment 20).

Immediately after the 1987 ALA Midwinter Meeting, the Advisory Committe held a day-and-a-half meeting to discuss a draft of the final report which included several suggestions for changes in the lists of items and instructions. Those changes were incorporated into revised documents which were reviewed by the committee and dissussed by phone before revised lists (see Attachments 4 and 5) were sent to participating states with a memo explaining changes (see Attachment 10). Revised lists were also sent to all other states with an invitation to join the system.

Finally, the Advisory Committee met at the 1987 Annual Conference to revise a proposal for Year One of the Expansion Phase and to discuss general matters related to the expansion of the system (see Attachment 21).

2. Proposal: "Publish articles in appropriate periodicals describing the pilot project system and encouraging participation when the national system is operationalized."

Although press releases were issued (see Attachment 22 and 23) and several brief announcements were published, no lengthy articles were prepared. As the project developed, it seemed more appropriate to wait until results were available before talking about the system.

3. Proposal: "Speak to programs, boards, committees at ALA Annual Conference June 1985 and to state or regional library associations in Fall 1985.

WORK DONE: When the proposal was written, it was assumed that invitations would be forthcoming. None was issued and we did not seek them out because of our decision (see above) to wait until results are available.

Additional Work Done

As the project developed, it became clear that several additional tasks should be done in order to establish a firm base for the Cooperative System. Those tasks are described below:

1. Source of population figures.

   Because national statistics on public libraries have traditionally been presented in terms of a figure for "population served" by the library, we thought it would be useful to explore the source of those population figures. Unless there is some standardization regarding population figures, it may not be completely legitimate to compare libraries on this basis.

   Attachment 24 shows the results of a study based on state forms and reports collected in 1983. As might be expected, most states relied on the latest decennial census with a few relying on a state agency (which might have updated figures). These practices may change as the 1980 Census becomes more out-of-date. It is also worth noting that most states either provide the figure at the state level or instruct the library on what source to use.

   Given the many difficulties inherent in using population figures in a mobile society, it seems reasonable to conclude that comparison of libraries in different states on the basis of population served figures used in state reports is legitimate.

2. Dates when states began to collect statistics from public libraries.

   While gathering background materials for an article on the Cooperative System, we became curious to know if any pattern existed regarding the years in which state library agencies began to collect statistics annually from public libraries. Attachment 25 is the result of a preliminary study conducted for us at the University of Illinois. This preliminary work revealed that in the first ten states from which reports were available, beginning dates seemed to range from 1903 to 1972. This study also revealed that it would be very difficult to document such dates for all states even in a very large research library. No futher work was done.

3. Establishing a collection of annual statistical reports on public libraries from states.

   It seems logical to assume that the development and usefulness of the Cooperative System should be supported by a regularly updated collection of annual statistical reports from all 50 states. It also seems logical that the collection be established at ALA in the Headquarters Library. When

this matter was first explored, the Library had one or more annual statistical reports from 16 states and no system for ensuring that new volumes are added each year.

The collection of state reports gathered by OFR in its 1983-1984 contract work for NCES was given to the Headquarters Library. A free-lance librarian was hired to do the technical work necessary for incorporating the material into the collection and to prepare letters for each state indicating what we have, asking for any later material, and requesting that ALA be sent copies annually. This activity laid the groundwork for a collection that will be of value to anyone wanting to consult public library statistics from states.

4. Consistency of items and instructions on forms for FY86 data collection in pilot states.

The Cooperative System is based on the idea that each state will incorporate a standard list of items and instructions into the state form. To ensure that this was happening in pilot states, a free-lance librarian was hired to check the first 11 states for compliance with the March 25, 1986 lists. The analysis revealed that compliance was complete for two sections on the items list: Section IV. Expenditures and Section IX. Selected Technology. There were small problems with a few states in other sections. (The report of this work was handwritten on sheets too large to use as attachments).

5. Meetings for participants.

Pilot project participants at the March 1986 workshop expressed a desire to meet regularly to discuss common concerns. Meetings for participants and interested others were held at the 1986 Annual Conference, the 1987 Midwinter Meeting, and the 1987 Annual Conference. At each meeting the Principal Investigator summarized work done to date, participants described what was happening in their state, and general concerns were discussed. A Project Summary handout was prepared for each Annual Conference. The latest version is Attachment 26.

IV. Results of Pilot Project

A. Number of Participants

1. Pilot project: Five state libraries have already contributed FY86 data to the pilot project: California, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, and Utah. Ten others have promised such data by the end of 1987: Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wyoming.

2. Possiblities for the future: The following thirteen state libraries have indicated that they may participate in the Cooperative System in the future: Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

B. Form of Participation

Most participants are states sending floppy disks prepared using Lotus 1-2-3. All but California did this themselves. (A consultant prepared California's data using forms collected by the California State Library). Indiana and Pennsylvania will send a magnetic tape.

C. The Multi-State Report

The report from all states will be completed in early 1988. The Advisory Committee discussed this topic at the 1986 Annual Conference and agreed that the aggregate report should include summary tables such as the ones in Statistics of Public Libraries, 1981-1982.[10] However, the tables should show more population served ranges. (See Attachment 20 for details.) Sam Peng believes this is possible but will not know until more data are available. Larry La Moure is currently using results from the first five states to prepare preliminary estimates.

D. Potential for a 50-State System

This pilot project was begun because it seemed logical to believe that existing annual data collection procedures in the states could be used to gather statistics for periodic national reports. Although we encountered the problems we expected to find in matters such as timing of data collection and consistency of definition, we also learned that many librarians are eager to see the system succeed, able to compromise to get consistent data from state to state, and skilled in using microcomputers to analyze data.

It will take time and resources to establish a 50-state system, but our experience with the pilot has convinced us that it can and should be done.

V. Suggestions--Future

A. Expansion Phase.

Until the Cooperative System involves a large majority of states, its development will need financial and technical support. It seems advisable that funds come from the Department of Education and technical support from ALA's OFR and from OERI's Center for Education Statistics for a period of about three years following the pilot. During the Expansion Phase the following activities should take place:

1. Monitor participating states to ensure that data are compatible both in terms of definitions used and in terms of format for reporting in machine-readable form.

2. Encourage additional states to join the system through a program that involves both direct contact with potential participants and wide dissemination of information about what the Cooperative System is and has accomplished.

3. Provide technical assistance to states interested in joining the Cooperative System. This involves such things as advice regarding modification of an existing form and instructions and the assistance of a computer consultant regarding hardware and software.

4. Produce aggregate reports displaying basic descriptive statistics on public libraries in participating states.

5. Produce special analyses of data on topics of particular interest and publish them as examples of what can be done with data.

6. Sponsor workshops for potential participants to explain how to participate and how to use data locally.

7. Provide opportunities for participants and potential participants to meet and discuss problems and opportunities inherent in the emerging Cooperative System.

8. Explore ways for the system to expand and become firmly established as part of the regular operation of CES and state library agencies.

A proposal for Year One of the Expansion Phase is in the final draft stages at ALA and will be submitted as soon as necessary approvals have been obtained. The proposal assumes that in the first year the Principal Investigator and Advisory Committee will attempt to increase the number of states in the system and work with Larry La Moure, the newly appointed coordinator of library statistics in CES, to determine what must be done at CES and in the states to establish the system and what costs will be involved.

B. Operational Phase

1. Timing. In the past, federal surveys of public libraries were done at one point in time--all institutions in the sample were asked to report data from the fiscal year preceding the time of data collection. The Cooperative System is different. In order to gain the sizeable advantage of having state library agencies collect, validate, and key the data into a machine-readable file, the system had to accept two troublesome facts: 1) states have different fiscal years and 2) states vary in their power to force libraries to provide data rapidly. In some states existing law may interfere with rapid collection of statistics. In Pennsylvania, for example, state law mandates that public libraries report statistics by October of the year after the fiscal (calendar) year.

   For these reasons, the Cooperative System will not be able to publish an aggregate report covering a particular fiscal year until more than a year after that calendar year has ended. This situation can be mitigated somewhat if appropriate plans are made to have the aggregate report published rapidly after it is ready. It might also be possible to publish preliminary reports as early states return data.

   Another timing issue involves changes in the items and/or instructions. Because things are changing rapidly in libraries, it is expected that there will be pressure for change in the items collected or in the

definitions used. State library agencies differ in their ability to make changes without consulting libraries in the state. Even when a state can make changes independently, it needs to know several months before the end of its fiscal year to allow for printing and distribution of forms. Finally, if the new or revised item requires that data be collected over time, libraries may need time to collect data before reporting it.

It is also essential to balance the need for statistics on new developments with the need to maintain consistent categories for time series analysis.

The Cooperative System will need to make creative use of modern communications and computer technology to deal with these issues and to involve the library community in solving the problems they present.

2. Management.

The U.S. Department of Education through the Library Program Office and the Center for Education Statistics, has supported initiation of the Cooperative System. ALA's Office for Research has coordinated the work with encouragement from COSLA. In the future, all of these agencies should be involved. In addition, ALA's Library Administration and Management Association and ALA's Public Library Association and ALA's Association of Specialized and Cooperative Agencies can and should have roles.

It seems likely that the system can best be based at the Center for Education Statistics which could contract with COSLA or ALA for Assistance as needed. CES has considerable experience in working through state agencies to gather data from elementary and secondary schools and from institutions of higher education. Experience and contacts gained in those efforts can be helpful in establishing similar arrangements for library statistics.

It seems likely also that such things as assisting some states with funds will be always needed for programming and data entry, preparation and production of analytical reports, education of state library agency personnel, and promotion of the system in the library community.

3. Content. The content of the list of items and instructions for the Cooperative System has changed several times since the project began. Each time the changes were relatively minor, but were based on a very careful consideration of suggestions from pilot project participants and of events/decisions in related statistics gathering projects.

For the record, the latest lists of Items and Instructions (March 1987) is the last of several version which are listed below:

November 1984	Included in "Analysis of Library Data Collection and Development of Plans for the Future"
December 1985	After analysis by pilot project Advisory Committee
March 1986	After discussion with participants at March 1986 Workshop (see Attachments 2 and 3)

The March 1987 version of the Items and Instructions lists is as problem-free as possible. However, we encountered problems with several items that cannot really be solved but should be understood by persons who work with this system in the future. Those problems are described below in numerical order by line number on the latest list of items (see Attachments 4 and 5). If an item does not appear here, the Principal Investigator and Advisory Committee are not aware of any problems as of August 1987.

General Issues

1. Definition of a public library. Item 10 in the "Introduction" to the Instructions states that "the exact determination of the libraries in a state to be considered 'public' shall be the responsibility of the state library agency." This means that state reports are not completely comparable. Although there is no way to avoid this lack of comparability, persons who interpret the national report should be aware of it. This matter was discussed at the Workshop. (See page 4 of Attachment 12 for brief discussion of different criteria. See also page 11 of Attachment 12, items 2 and 5).

2. System support. Because some libraries receive support from systems and others do not, two libraries may not be comparable even though they serve the same size "population of legal service area." A library with system support could serve a certain number of people with less money and staff than a library without system support. Someone should investigate what this means for the validity of comparing libraries on the basis of population of legal service area only.

3. System service centers. It is unclear how states will deal with system service centers. The definition for "population of legal service area" tells states not to report statistics for service centers that do not serve the public directly, but the instructions are silent on whether or not those centers should be reported to the Cooperative System in any way. This matter should be considered in the future.

Part I--General Information

Line 1. Population of legal service area.

Although "population served" is the basic variable used to describe public libraries, it is not a completely reliable figure for the following reasons:

a. Many libraries are involved in numerous formal and informal cooperative arrangements. Even if a contract does not exist, libraries may have some other specified reason to provide service to persons not in the legal service area.

b. Although most libraries do not circulate materials to non-residents, most libraries do not restrict entrance to the building, in-library use of the collection, or in-person reference service to persons living in the legal service area. Therefore, they may be providing these services to many people not in the legal service area.

c. Some libraries serve areas where the population fluctuates because of seasonal activities (see Workshop Proceedings, Attachment 12). The Cooperative System did not take a stand on how population is to be counted in those states.

The situation in Ohio presents the most serious problem with the concept of "population of legal service area." Although public libraries in Ohio do have "legal services areas" as defined in the Cooperative System Instructions, they are also bound by law to serve everyone in their county. In the past, a portion of the state "intangibles tax" was collected by the county and used for distribution to the county's libraries. The law was changed in 1986, however, and libraries are currently funded by a percentage of the state income tax. The dollars come to each county as the Libraries and Local Government Support Fund, and most of the amount is spent on public libraries. Many public libraries in Ohio receive all of their support from the state, and some (not necessarily the same ones) distribute statewide cards.

For all of these reasons, the Ohio State Library did not report "population of legal service area" to the Cooperative System. They do not want to be in the position of making such designations and risking objections from libraries. This means that Ohio libraries cannot be compared with others on the basis of population of legal service area.

Line 2. Registered borrowers.

The validity of this number as a true measure of the library's status in a community and/or as a useful way to compare libraries is questionable for the following reasons:

-some libraries do not require registration.
-some libraries give registration cards away in a mass distribution.
-some libraries never weed files of registrants.
-some libraries give family cards to be used by several people.
-borrowing from a library is only one way to use it. Other important uses include getting answers to questions asked by telephone and using materials in the library.
-some libraries register as borrowers persons not in the legal service area.

Although most participants in the March 1986 Workshop expressed skepticism about the validity of this figure, none wanted to drop it from the system because it is a traditional measure of commitment to use a library that many libraries like to report and because the general public believes it means something.

Part II--Library Staff

Lines 7, 8, 9, 10. Librarians

The listing of three types of "librarians"-- with master's degree from program accredited by ALA (line 7), with any other master's degree (line 8), other persons holding title of librarian (line 9) all three to add up to "Total librarians" (line 10) was a compromise between those who wanted the Cooperative System to accept as a librarian only someone with a degree from an accredited program and those who wanted the Cooperative System to accept anyone with the title of "librarian." The question of who may qualify for the title "librarian" has been discussed in many forums and involves a number of legal, political, and practical issues. Although ALA's Office for Library Personnel Resources has developed a definition that stresses the nature of the work done, ALA has never solved the problem of educational qualifications in a way that satisfies everyone. One reason for this situation may be the reality of public librarianship described in Table 15, "Educational Status of Employed Librarians by Type of Library" in the 1983 study of Library Human Resources (see Attachment 27).[11] This table shows that 27% of public "librarians" nationwide have no degree or certificate and others have credentials that may be questionable.

Since it seems unlikely that the Cooperative System could devise an answer that would be acceptable to the many groups involved, a compromise was suggested for 1986 data collection (see Attachments 2 and 3) and modified for 1987 data collection (see Attachments 4 and 5). The results of this "experiment" should be closely monitored. Some critics have suggested that many libraries will not be able to provide lines 7, 8, and 9 easily and may be unwilling to search personnel records to find the necessary information.

Part III--Income

The system was designed to yield information about the income received directly by individual libraries from specific sources. It should NOT be used to compute a total of state funds or federal funds spent on public libraries in a particular state. This information is readily available from the issuing agencies and will be more accurate from such sources.

The major reason for this reality is that state and/or federal funds may be given to library systems to support services provided to individual libraries. Because many system headquarters do not serve the public directly, they will not report statistics to the Cooperative System. Because individual libraries do not receive any dollars directly, they would not show them as income received from the state. But the state is spending that money on public libraries.

Part IV--Library Expenditures

Note: Public libraries vary in the extent to which parent governmental units (e.g., city, county) pay for such costs as: employee benefits of all staff, salaries and benefits of maintenance staff, and data processing costs. This fact influences the comparability of income and expenditure figures.

Lines 19 and 20. Salaries and Wages, Employee Benefits.

Both exclude plant operations and maintenance staff, which are to be reported on line 29. However, there is evidence that a small percentage of libraries may not be able to separate out salaries, wages, and benefits for this category of staff without more work than they are willing to do.

Line 23.--Serial subscriptions (include all physical formats).

"Serial" is the correct term for all publications issued in successive parts, but public libraries are used to speaking of "magazines" or "periodicals" and "newspapers." The Cooperative System needs to monitor state use of the term and any problems it may have caused with reporting.

Line 24.--Machine-readable materials.

The definition used here was created for the Cooperative System since widespread use of these materials is too recent for the term to have appeared in the 1983 Z39 standard used for all other definitions.[12] We worked closely with the academic librarians on this matter and believe we have a definition that is widely acceptable. However, new technological developments may make changes necessary.

Line 33. Capital outlay.

Because states vary in what they consider to be capital outlay and we decided that the Cooperative System would accept what libraries reported as defined by their state, amounts may not be comparable from state to state.

Part V--Library Collection, Fiscal Year 19XX

Note: Earlier versions of the Items and Instructions implied that only cataloged items were to be reported, but the latest version tells libraries to estimate the number of titles that are uncataloged. While working on another project, the Principal Investigator became aware that public libraries vary in their policies for cataloging such types of material as paperbacks, records, and art prints. When one library catalogs such items and another library does not, the count of items in the two libraries is not comparable if only cataloged items are included. After some discussion of this dilemma, the Advisory Committee agreed to allow the inclusion of an estimate of uncataloged materials. This should make data more comparable. However, the lack of uniformity in this matter should be of concern to the public library community.

Line 40. Government documents in separate collections.

The issue of how to count government documents is complex, and no one in the library community seems to have a solution that is acceptable to all interested parties. The solution suggested here (see Attachment 42, p. 8) may need to be changed in the future, especially as policies change in the Government Printing Office regarding distribution of documents in electronic form. Persons responsible for coordinating the Cooperative System should monitor the work of at least the following groups on this matter: the unit in the Superintendent of Documents Office that collects statistics biennally from depository libraries, ALA's Government Documents Round Table, the library statistics form in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), and the Association of Research Libraries.

Part VII--Local Library Service, Fiscal Year

Line 53. Circulation transactions.

Earlier versions of the Items list included separate lines for circulation to adults and circulation to juveniles in the belief that information was needed on public library service to children and youth. However, many libraries do not collect any information on circulation to different age groups and are not willing to begin. The Cooperative System probably cannot solve the problem until states and local libraries solve it.

Line 56. Online database searches.

It seems likely that the number of online searches conducted in libraries will drop rapidly in the next few years because databases are becoming available on CD-ROM disks that are owned locally. Therefore, any changes in the number reported should not be interpreted to mean that libraries are doing fewer searches of machine-readable databases. They may, in fact, be doing more since they will not have to pay online connect charges to access data owned on CD-ROM.

VI. Conclusion

The pilot project described in this report is quite different from what was originally proposed. It took longer, involved more states, and accomplished somewhat different tasks. In the final analysis, however, the pilot project was very successful. It examined the problems involved in creating a 50-state system; it solved those problems--at least partially--for a group of 15 states; and it established a solid base upon which the larger system can be built. An unexpected side benefit has been an upgrading of state data collection activities in quality control of statistics received from local libraries and in the use of microcomputer programs to organize data. The principal investigator has only one regret--that the aggregate data report cannot be produced until approximately six months after the completion of the pilot due to unavoidable constraints on the state library agencies. At this time, however, we do know that data from the first four states has been successfully transferred to the CES mainframe and used successfully in exploratory data analysis. This bodes well for the eventual completion of an aggregate report of FY86 data.

We know also that enthusiasm for the system is high among the fifteen pilot project participants and that thirteen additional states have expressed interest in joining the system at some time. If this momentum can be sustained, the Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection could be a reality by the early 1990's.

87-3169k

VII. References

1. Mary Jo Lynch, Sources of Library Statistics: 1972-1982 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1983).

2. John Rather, An Annotated Bibliography of Recurring Surveys (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961).

3. Herbert Goldhor, "Library Statistics for 1974 Published by State and Provincial Library Agencies" in Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1978), 215-234.

4. Kenneth D. Shearer, The Collection and Use of Public Library Statistics by State Agencies: A Compilation of Forms (Chicago: ALA/Library Administration and Management Association, 1978).

5. American Association of State Libraries, Standards for Library Functions at the State Level (Chicago: American Library Association, 1970), 3.

6. David C. Palmer, Planning for a National System of Library Statistics (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970), 1.

7. Alphonse Trezza and Barbara Slanker, "Final Report: Library General Information Survey (LIBGIS) State Participation and Development," Prepared as Part of Contract No, OEC-0-72-1465 U.S. Office of Education Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 14, 1974, Photocopied, 28-32.

8. Mary Jo Lynch, "Analysis of Library Data Collection and Development of Plans for the Future," Final Report to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) on Department of Education contract No. 300-83-0246 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1984) Photocopied.

9. Mary Jo Lynch, "The Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Pilot Project," Unsolicited Proposal to the U.S. Department of Education (American Library Association, Chicago, December 1984) Photocopied.

10. Statistics of Public Libraries, 1981-1982, Data gathered by the National Center for Education Statistics, (Chicago: Public Library Association, 1985).

11. Library Human Resources: A Study of Supply and Demand A report prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics and the Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies by King Research, Inc. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1983), 44.

12. American National Standard for Library and Information Sciences and Related Publishing Practices--Library Statistics (New York: American National Standards Institute, 1983).

04-3119k

VIII. Advisory Committee

Wesley Doak
State Librarian
Oregon State Library
State Library Building
Salem, OR 97310
(503) 378-4367

Jan Feye-Stukas, Library Specialist
Library Development and Services
440 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
(612) 296-2821

Amy Owen
Deputy Director
Utah State Library
2150 South 300 West Suite 16
Salt Lake City, UT 85115
(801) 466-5888

Patricia Smith
Texas State Library
1201 Brazos Street
P. O. Box 12927, Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
(512) 463-5465

Barratt Wilkins
State Librarian
State Library of Florida
R. A. Gray Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(904) 487-2651

87-3170k

IX. Attachments

Note: These attachments do not include all documents and correspondence issued during the pilot project. Selected for inclusion were items illustrating the process used and the issues discussed.

1 Letter of September 30, 1985 sent to chief officer of each state library agency (with one enclosure)

2 Cooperative Public Library Data System: Instructions, 3-25-86

3 Cooperative Public Library Data System: Data Items, 3-25-86

4 Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Instructions 03-06-87

5 Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Data Items 03-06-87

6 Memo of October 24, 1985 to Advisory Committee regarding "Questions related to proposed items and definitions"

7 Memo of February 14, 1986 to Advisory Committee regarding "Possible Changes in Items and Instructions"

8 Memo of February 26, 1986 to Advisory Committee regarding "Questions from Oklahoma on Items and Definitions"

9 Memo of March 17, 1986 to Advisory Committee regarding "Proposed revisions to Items and Instructions"

10 Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Changes for 1987 data collection, 03-09-87

11 Workshop Agenda

12 Proceedings of Workshop held March 13 & 14, 1986

13 "When can CS expect to receive FY86 statistics from the majority of libraries in your state?"

14 Memo of July 25, 1986 to participants regarding "Update" (i.e. Meeting at Annual Conference, Reporting FY data to the Center for Statistics, Problem Areas)

15 Memo of August 28, 1987 to Participants regarding "Update, August 1987"

16 Memo of May 12, 1987 to Yvonne Carter and Samuel Peng regarding Status of 1986 public library statistics from states

17 Agenda for Advisory Committee Meeting on November 7 & 8, 1985

18 Memo of 11-10-87 to Advisory Committee regarding "Meeting on November 7 and 8, 1985"

19 Memo of January 30, 1986 to Advisory Committee regarding "'Minutes' of Meeting at Midwinter, 1986"

20 Memo of July 24, 1986 to Advisory Committee regarding "Summary of meeting at Annual Conference"

21 Memo of August 21, 1987 to Advisory Committee regarding "Meeting in San Francisco"

22 "ALA Office for Research to Study Cooperative Public LIbrary Data Collection" Press Release from ALA, October 1985

23 "Workshop on Data Collection Project Held: Open Meeting Planned" Press Release from ALA, March, 1986

24 Use of Population Served Figures in 1983 State Forms and Reports: Summary

25 Letter dated November 13, 1986 from Chris Jocius at the University of Illinois Library Research Center (with enclosure)

26 Pilot Project Summary, June, 1987 (the last revision of document issued three times)

27 Table 15. Educational Status of Employed Librarians by Type of Library: January 1, 1982

Attachment #1

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

September 30, 1985

Dear :

The U.S. Department of Education has awarded ALA a contract to conduct a pilot project leading to "A Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection." The goal of the pilot is to discover and solve problems which would be involved in establishing a cooperative system involving all 50 states. This will be done by working with a small group of state library agencies who volunteer to modify the state form to incorporate NCES data items and establish procedures for reporting cooperatively to NCES or its successor agency.

This project builds upon the concept of cooperative data collection recommended to NCES by ALA in its November 1984 report on an "Analysis of Library Data Collection and Development of a Plan for the Future." The concept was endorsed by COSLA at its October 1984 meeting.

Although the materials and opinions gathered for the earlier project could be used to select likely states for the pilot project, it has been recommended that all states have the opportunity to be involved. Therefore this letter of invitation is being sent to the Chief Officer of each state library agency.

The enclosed Volunteer Form lists what will be expected of each participant and asks applicants to answer several questions. If you wish your state to be considered, please fill in and return the enclosed form so that it will reach us by October 31st. The Advisory Committee will meet in early November to decide which states will be involved.

Please call me (collect) if you have questions about this invitation. We are very excited about the potential of the project to improve the availability of statistics for everyone concerned with public libraries and hope you will consider participating.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Jo Lynch, Ph.D.
Director
ALA Office for Research

Enclosures (2)

cc: Sandra Cooper
Roger Parent
Shirley Mills-Fischer

Cooperative Public Library Data Collection Pilot Project
Volunteer Form

The State of_____ would like to participate in the pilot project for developing a cooperative public library data collection system. We have answered the questions below and realize that we would be expected to:

1. Agree to incorporate NCES data items and definitions as completely as possible in our annual data collection effort in June or July 1986.

2. Send to ALA/OFR, within 30 days of notification of selection, a critique of the NCES form (copy enclosed) in terms of which items would be difficult to incorporate into the state form and work with ALA/OFR to resolve the difficulties.

3. Pay transportation expenses for two persons to a workshop in Chicago in March of 1986. Other expenses will be covered by the project.

Please answer the following questions:

1. Does the state library agency have a free hand in the design of content and format of public library statistics form?
   Yes
   No

If no, please explain who else is involved.

2. Does by state law or regulation govern the time the survey is conducted?
   No
   Yes

If yes, please explain

3. Who is(are) the person(s) we should contact about the collection of public library statistics in your state?

Name

Title

Phone

Signature _____
Chief Officer of State Library Agency

46-1794 9/27/85

59-2151k 3-25-86

Cooperative Public Library Data System
Instructions

Introduction

1. The purpose of this system is to ensure the collection of comparable data in all states. These data will be useful in the creation of a composite report on the public libraries of the United States by the national Center for Statistics. They will also be useful in state-to-state comparisons.

2. Data items and definitions have been specified for incorporation into state forms. A state form may very well request more data from libraries but only these data need be reported nationally.

3. Each state library agency is responsible for the quality of the data from libraries in that state. When the data are reported to the Center for Statistics some checks will be perform on the data, but state library agencies should "eyeball" what is reported to them before sending it to the Center and should perform machine edits if possible.

4. States will report data for each library in the state. A paper report is acceptable; machine-readable reports are preferrable. The Center for Statistics uses IBM equipment but can handle compatibility problems.

5. The system will collect and report data for a single fiscal year. States may collect this data at different times because state fiscal years differ. In many states the FY is from July 1 to June 30 and statistics for the year are collected in the summer but other states have different cycles. The national report will include data for a fiscal year, not data collected at one point in time but covering different fiscal years.

6. Where annual figures are requested they should be figures from the most recent complete fiscal year. Where a simple count is requested it should be accurate as of the end of that fiscal year.

7. Definitions are important to ensure comparability of data from different libraries and states. Definitions in these instructions should be incorporated into instructions sent out in each state. For the most part, these definitions were taken from the standard for library statistics approved in 1983 by the National Information Standards Organization (Z39).

8. Estimates are important if exact data are not available. Reporting libraries should not leave any items blank. They should enter "0" if the appropriate entry for an item is zero or "none" and enter "N/A" if an item does not apply to a particular library. If an exact figure is not available for a particular item, but it is known that the amount is greater than zero, the librarian should ENTER AN ESTIMATE OF THE AMOUNT and indicate that the figure is an estimate by enclosing it in brackets.

9. State library personnel should encourage libraries to collect data in these catagories so that estimates will not be necessary in future years.

10. The cooperative system will include information on public libraries defined as follows: a public library is one that serves all residents of a given community, district, or region and (typically) receives its financial support, in whole or in part, from public funds. The exact determination of the libraries in a state to be considered "public" shall be the responsibility of the state library agency.

PART I - General Information

This section requests information on the number of people served by the library and on public service outlets.

POPULATION OF LEGAL SERVICE AREA (Item 1). The number of people in the geographical area for which a public library has been established to offer services and from which (or on behalf of which) the library derives income plus any areas served under contract. THE DETERMINATION OF THIS POPULATION FIGURE SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY. States should not provide this item for service centers or system headquarters which do not serve the public directly .

REGISTERED BORROWERS (Item 2). A registered borrower is a library user who has applied for and received an identification number or card from the public library which establishes the conditions under which the user may borrow materials. States should not report this figure unless it is known that the library has purged its file at least once within the last three years. If the library has household registration rather than or in addition to individual registration the state should report individuals by multiplying the number of households registered by the average number of persons in each household in the state.

CENTRAL LIBRARY (Item 3). The single unit library or the unit where the principal collections are kept and handled. Also called Main Library. Some county, multicounty and regional library systems may not have a main library. Some systems may have an administrative center which is separate from the principal collections and is not open to the public.This type of building should not be reported.

BRANCH LIBRARIES (Item 4). Branch libraries are auxiliary units which have all of the following: (1) separate quarters, (2) a permanent basic collection of books, (3) a permanent staff, and (4) a regular schedule for opening to the public. They are, however, administered from a central unit. Regional or divisional centers should be counted as branches.

BOOKMOBILE (Item 5). A truck or van especially equipped to carry books and other library materials and serve as a traveling branch library. Count vehicles, not stops.

OTHER PUBLIC SERVICE OUTLETS (Item 6). Include collections in nursing homes, prisons, etc.

PART II - LIBRARY STAFF

Report figures as of the last day of the fiscal year. Include unfilled positions if a search is currently underway.

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES. The sum of full-time employees plus a count of the number of persons who would be in a particular category when the time spent by part-time persons is summed and divided by the time spent by a full-time person. To compute full-time equivalents (FTE) of part-time employees, take the number of hours worked per week by a part-time employee and divide it by 40, the number established for the national system to ensure comparability of data. If libraries in a state typically use a 40 hour week the state library agency may ask them to report FTE's. If the number of hours considered full-time varies, the state library agency should ask libraries to report hours worked per week and divide that number by 40 for reporting to the national system.

LIBRARIAN (Items 7-10). A staff member doing work that requires professional training and skill in the theoretical or scientific aspect of library work, or both, as distinct from its mechanical or clerical aspect. The usual educational requirement is a master's degree (or its historical antecedent) from a library education program approved by the American Library Association. States should collect information about three kinds of persons with the title of librarian: persons with master's degrees from programs accredited by ALA; persons with any other master's degree holding the title of librarian; other persons holding the title of librarian.

ALL OTHER PAID STAFF (Item 11). Includes all other persons paid by the library budget except plant operations and maintenance staff.

Note: states are free to collect information about staff in any way which satisfies local needs and accomodates local sensitivities. For national reporting, however, the distinctions made above should be observed.

PART III - LIBRARY INCOME BY SOURCE

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SOURCES (Item 13). All tax and nontax receipts allocated by the community, district, or region of the public library, and available for expenditure by the public library. Do NOT include here the value of any contributed or in-kind services and the value of any gifts and donations, fines or fees.

STATE SOURCES (Item 14). All revenue from funds collected by the State and distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, except for Federal moneys distributed by the States.

FEDERAL SOURCES (Items 15-17). All revenue from funds collected by the Federal Government and distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, including Federal moneys distributed by the States.

REVENUE SHARING (Item 15). All revenue from the Federal Government, under the Federal Revenue Sharing Programs, and distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, including such Federal moneys distributed by the State.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT (LSCA) FUNDS (Item 16). All funds from the LSCA distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries.

OTHER FEDERAL (Item 17). All revenue from the Federal Government other than that reported in items 12 and 13 distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, including such Federal moneys distributed by the State.

OTHER INCOME (Item 18). Report all income other than that reported in Items 13 through 17. Include, for example, gifts, donations, interest, fines, fees. This amount is the difference between the sum of the income reported in Items 13 through 17 and the total income, reported in Item 19. Do NOT include the value of any contributed services or the value of "in-kind" gifts and donations.

PART IV - LIBRARY EXPENDITURES FROM ALL SOURCES,

Part IV has been divided into three sections in order to facilitate reporting. All operating expenditures should be reported in Section A, Standard Operating Expenditures, which includes specific items that appear in most library operating budgets (Items 20-32). All other expenses should be reported in item 33 so that item 34 IS A TOTAL OF ALL OPERATING EXPENDITURES. Section B requests information on capital expenditures. Section C, Selected Special Expenditures, includes lines for expenditures which may appear in different places on different library budgets. (For example, online database searching may be considered under collection expenditures in some libraries. In others it may be reported under "other operating expenditures.") It is expected that amounts reported in Section C have already been reported in Section A or B. They are requested here, however, so that trends in these important areas may be documented.

Section A. Standard Operating Expenditures

OPERATING EXPENDITURE. The current and recurrent costs necessary to the provision of library service, such as personnel, library materials, binding, supplies, repair or replacement of existing furnishings and equipment, and costs incurred in the operation and maintenance of the physical facility. Note: local accounting practice shall determine whether a particular expense is an operating expense or a capital expense regardless of the examples in the definition.

SALARIES AND WAGES (Item 20). This amount should be the salaries and wages for all library staff except plant operation and maintenance staff for the fiscal year. Salaries for plant operation and maintenance staff, if paid from the library budget, should be reported in Item 31. Include salaries and wages before deductions, but exclude "employee benefits."

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS (Item 21). The benefits outside of salary and wages paid and accruing to an employee except plant operations and maintenance staff , regardless of whether the benefits or equivalent cash options are available to all employees. Include amounts spent by the library for direct, paid employee benefits including Social Security, retirement, medical insurance, life insurance, guaranteed disability income protection, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, tuition, and housing benefits. If these benefits are not paid from the library budget mark N/A.

PRINT MATERIAL (Item 22). Material consisting primarily of words and usually produced by making an impression with ink on paper. Included in this category are materials that do not require magnification: books, bound periodicals, government documents, braille material, ephemeral print material, and the like.

SERIAL (Item 23). A publication issued in successive parts, usually at regular intervals, and as a rule, intended to be continued indefinitely. Serials include periodicals, newspapers, annual (reports, yearbooks, etc.), memoirs, proceedings, and transactions of societies.

MICROFORM (Item 24). A photographic reproduction of textual, tabular, or graphic material reduced in size so that it can normally be used only with magnification. The two main types of microforms are microreproductions on transparent material, including roll microfilm, aperture cards, microfiche, and ultrafiche, and reproductions on opaque material.

COMPUTER APPLICATIONS SOFTWARE (Item 25). Programs, procedures, and associated documentation that instruct the computer to perform certain types of tasks, in contrast to the physical components or devices of a computer (hardware). E.g. Supercalc, dBaseIII. Do not include system operations software.

MACHINE-READABLE MATERIALS (Item 26). Material in a form designed to be processed by a machine,usually a computer, either as input or as output, that has data recorded on it in some form. Typically, these files are stored on such media as punched cards, paper tape, magnetic tape and discs, and digital videodiscs. E.g. U.S. census data tapes, reference tools on tape or disc. Do not count computer output that is eye-legible or can be read with magnification. Do not count bibliographic records used to manage the collection.

AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS (Item 27). Library materials that are displayed by visual projection or magnification or through sound reproduction, or both, including graphic material, audio material, motion pictures, and video material; also the special visual materials such as cartographic and three-dimensional material.

OTHER MATERIALS (Item 28). Include all expenditures for materials not reported in lines 22-27.

TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON COLLECTION (Item 29) Give total of Items 22-28. If a library is not able to provide details requested in these items but can provide a total figure, it should be reported in item 29.

CONSERVATION (Item 30). Amount spent on the specific measures, individual or collective, undertaken for the repair, maintenance, restoration, or protection of library materials, including but not limited to binding and rebinding, materials conversion, deacidification, lamination, and restoration. Do not include salaries.

PLANT OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (Item 31). OPERATION OF PLANT consists of the housekeeping activities concerned with keeping the physical plant open and ready for use. It includes cleaning, disinfecting, heating, lighting, communications, power, moving furniture, handling stores, caring for grounds, and other such housekeeping activities as are repeated somewhat regularly on a daily, weekly, monthly, or seasonal basis. Include minor repairs (e.g. broken windows). Include salaries of plant operation and maintenance staff staff if paid from library budget.

FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT (Item 32). Include expenditures for all furniture and equipment purchased during the fiscal year. Includes microform equipment, audiovisual equipment and computer related equipment.

OTHER OPERATING EXPENDITURES (Item 33). Include all expenditures other than those given in items 20-32. Include system operations software if it is not included in cost of hardware.

TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES (Item 34). Include items 20-33.

Section B

CAPITAL OUTLAY (Item 35) Funds for the acquisition of or additions to fixed assets such as building sites, new buildings and building additions, new equipment (including major computer installations), initial book stock, furnishings for new or expanded buildings and new vehicles. This excludes replacement and repair or existing furnishings and equipment and regular purchase of library materials and investments for capital appreciation. Note: Local accounting practices shall determine whether a specific item is a capital expense or an operating expense regardless of examples in the definitions.

Section C. Selected Special Expenditures

This section includes lines for expenditures which may appear in different places on different library budgets. (For example, online database searching may be considered under collection expenditure in some libraries and under "other operating expenditures" in other libraries. It is expected that amounts reported in Section C HAVE ALREADY BEEN REPORTED in Sections A or B. They are requested here, however, so that trends in these important areas may be documented.

POSTAGE (Item 36). Include all expenditures for postage and delivery, including U.S. Mail and commerical delivery services during the fiscal year.

TELEPHONES and other TELECOMMUNICATIONS (Item 37). Include separately billed expenditures for all types of telephone service and for such services as electronic mail, teleconferencing, telefacsimile, teletype, telex.

CONTRACTED COMPUTER SERVICES (Item 38). Include any costs related to purchased library services done for your library on computers by a computerized library network, computerized cooperative library organization or by a commercial organization providing library services. Associated telecommunications costs may be included if they are not billed separately and reported in item 35.

ONLINE DATABASE SEARCHING (Item 39). Costs of reference transactions in which the source utilized is one or more databases searched online by computer. Associated telecommunications costs may be included if they are not billed separately and reported in item 37.

COMPUTER HARDWARE (Item 40) include costs of computers, monitors, printers and other periferals. Include system operations software if not billed separately.

PART V -- LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

Note: Unless otherwise indicated report for each item physical units held at the end of the year and titles held at the end of the year. Physical units are usually volumes but may also be cartridges or floppy disks. Titles are defined as follows: For reporting purposes, a title is a publication which forms a separate bibliographic whole, whether issued in one or several volumes, reels, discs, slides, or parts. It applies equally to printed materials, such as books and periodicals, as well as to audiovisual materials and microforms. Libraries should report the number of items for which a separate shelflist entry has been made. (SHELFLIST: A record of materials in a library, arranged in the order in which the materials stand when they are shelved or stored.) Thus, six copies of the same edition of a title count as one title; two editions of the same title which have been cataloged or recorded separately count as two titles; a set of six items for which six shelflist entries have been made counts as six titles; and two sets of the same edition for which one shelflist entry has been made count as one title.

METHOD FOR ESTIMATING THE NUMBER OF TITLES IN THE COLLECTION:

1. For libraries with a shelf list on cards :
A library which does not maintain a title count of its various collections, and that cannot easily count the number of separate shelflist cards, should use the following method for estimating this count:

1. Pressing the cards tightly together, measure the total number of inches in the shelflist.
2. Using the same amount of pressure, measure one inch of cards in the shelflist. Count the number of titles contained in the inch.
3. Repeat step 2 at regular intervals (for example, count one inch in every foot, or in every three feet, or other pre-established interval) to ensure measuring at least seven sample inches distributed throughout the shelflist.
4. Average the number of titles per inch in the samples. If any sample varies from the average by more than four cards, repeat steps one through four, applying more even pressure to the cards.
5. Multiply the average titles per inch by the total number of inches of cards in the shelflist.

2. For libraries with an automated shelflist:

Most software systems include a method of estimating titles from entries. Libraires should use whatever method their software provides. If no method is available, an estimate should be made.

BOOKS, BOUND SERIALS and GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS (Item 41) This is a general category intended to include all items cataloged and/or shelved with the regular collection. Do not count unbound serials

BOOK (Item 41). A nonperiodical printed publication bound in hard or soft covers, or in loose-leaf format, of at least forty-nine pages, exclusive of the cover pages; or a juvenile nonperiodical publication of any length bound in hard or soft covers.

SERIAL (Item 41). See definition for Item 23.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT (Items 41 and 42). A government document is any publication in book, serial, or other form of library material that is published by a government agency, e.g., the publications of federal, state, local, and foreign governments and of intergovernmental organizations to which governments belong and appoint representatives, such as the United Nations, Organization of American States, and the Erie Basin Commission. If government documents are cataloged and shelved with the regular collection they should be reported in Item 41. If they are kept in a separate collection they should be reported in Item 42.

PERIODICAL (Item 41). A publication in any medium intended to appear indefinitely at regular or stated intervals, generally more frequently than annually. Individual issues are numbered consecutively or dated and normally contain separate articles, stories, or other writings. Newspapers disseminating general news, and the proceedings, papers, or other publications of corporate bodies primarily related to their meetings, are not included in this term. Only bound volumes of periodical should be reported in Item 41.

NEWSPAPER (Item 41). A serial that is designed mainly to be a source of written information on current events. It may also include articles as well as illustrations, advertising, legal notices, and vital statistics. Newspapers appear with a masthead and are usually printed on newsprint without a cover. Only bound volumes of newspapers are reported in Item 41.

MICROFORM (Item 42). See definition for Item 24.

AUDIO MATERIAL (Item 44). A generic term for material on which sounds (only) are stored (recorded) and that can be reproduced (played back) mechanically or electronically, or both. This includes audiocassettes, audiocartridges, audiodiscs, audioreels, talking books, and other sound recordings.

FILMS (Item 45). The term film is used interchangeably with "motion picture" which is a length of film, with or without recorded sound, bearing a sequence of images that create the illusion of movement when projected in rapid succession (usually 18 or 24 frames per second). Motion pictures are produced in a variety of sizes (8, super 8, 16, 35, 55, and 70 mm) and a variety of formats (cartridge, cassette, loop, and reel). Common motion picture sizes in instructional use are 8mm, super 8mm, and 16mm.

VIDEO MATERIAL (Item 46). A generic term for material on which pictures, sound or both are recorded. Electronic playback reproduces pictures, soundsor both using a television receiver or monitor.

COMPUTER APPLICATIONS SOFTWARE (see definition for Item 25)

MACHINE-READABLE MATERIALS (see definition for item 26)

OTHER LIBRARY MATERIALS (Item 49). Include all materials not already reported.

CURRENT SERIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS (Item 50). Report titles received both subscription and gift. Do not report number of individual issues. The total number of subscriptions in the library system, including duplicates, should be reported in the first column. The total number of individual titles, excluding duplicates, should be reported in the second column.

PART VI -- LIBRARY SERVICE PER TYPICAL WEEK, 19XX

TYPICAL WEEK (Items 51-54). A typical week is a week in which the library is open its regular hours, containing no holidays. It is seven consecutive calendar days, from Sunday through Saturday, or whatever days the library is open during that period.

PUBLIC SERVICES HOURS PER TYPICAL WEEK (Item 51). Consider both main library and branches using the following method. If a library is open from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday, it should report 40 hours per week. If several of its branches are also open during those hours, the figure remains 40 hours. Should Branch A also be open one evening from 7:00 to 9:00, the total hours during which users can find service becomes 42. If Branch B is open the same hours on the same evening the total remains 42, but if it is open 2 hours on another evening, or from 5:00 to 7:00 on the evening when Branch A is open later, the total becomes 44 hours during which users can find service. Include bookmobiles if appropriate.

TOTAL ATTENDANCE IN LIBRARY PER TYPICAL WEEK (Item 52). Report the total number of persons entering the library per typical week including persons attending activities, meetings, and those persons requiring no staff services.

IN-LIBRARY USE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS PER TYPICAL WEEK (Item 53). Report the total number of materials utilized in the library, but not checked out. They include reference books, periodicals, book stock, and all other library materials that are used WITHIN the library. For one method of counting in-library use see Output Measures for Public Libraries (ALA, 1982).

TOTAL REFERENCE TRANSACTIONS COMPLETED PER TYPICAL WEEK (Item 54). Report the total reference transactions completed per typical week. A reference transaction is an information contact which involves the knowledge, use, recommendations, interpretation, or instruction in the use of one or more information sources by a member of the library staff. Includes information and referral service. Information sources include printed and non-printed materials, machine- readable data bases (including computer-assisted instruction), catalogs and other holdings records, and, through communication or referral, other libraries and institutions, and persons both inside and outside the library. When a staff member utilizes information gained from previous use of information sources to answer a question, report as a reference transaction, even if the source is not consulted again during this transaction.

Note: it is essential that libraries do not include directional transactions in the report of reference transactions. A directional transaction is an information contact which facilitates the use of the library in which the contact occurs and which does NOT involve the knowledge, use, recommendation, interpretation, or instruction in the use of, any information sources other than those which describe that library, such as schedules, floor plans, handbooks, and policy statements. Examples of directional transactions include giving instruction for locating, within the library, staff, library users, or physical features, etc., and giving assistance of a non-bibliographic nature with machines.

PART VII -- LOCAL LIBRARY SERVICE FISCAL YEAR

PUBLIC SERVICE HOURS, ANNUAL (Item 55). Count both main library and branches using the following method. If the main library is open 60 hours per week (60 times 52 weeks = 3120), less 5 days of 10 hours each closed for holidays, the main library total is 3120 less 50 = 3070 hours. If 3 branch libraries are also open the same number of hours as the main library (regardless of whether or not all facilities are open at the same time) the annual aggregate for the library is 4 times 3070 = 12,280 hours. Include bookmobiles if appropriate.

CIRCULATION TRANSACTION (Items 56-58). The act of lending an item from the library's collection for use generally (although not always) outside the library. This activity includes charging, either manually or electronically, and also renewals, each of which is reported as a circulation transaction. Report circulation of adult materials and juvenile materials separately using whatever definition of juvenile is acceptable in the state. If a library cannot provide figures for adult and juvenile materials circulation separately the total circulation should be reported in Item 58.

INFORMATION SERVICE TO GROUPS (Items 59-60). An information contact in which a staff member or person invited by a staff member provides information intended for a number of persons and planned in advance. Information service to groups may be either bibliographic instruction or library use presentations, or it may be cultural, recreational, or educational programs or presentations. Programs or presentations both on and off the library premises are included, as long as they are sponsored by the library. Does not include meetings sponsored by other groups using library meeting rooms.

ONLINE DATABASE SEARCH (Item 61). A reference transaction (see definition in item 52 above)in which the source utilized is one or more databases searched online by computer.

PART VIII. RESOURCE SHARING, FISCAL YEAR

INTERLIBRARY LOAN (Items 62-63). An item of library material, or a copy of the material, is made available by one library to another upon request. It includes both lending and borrowing. The libraries involved in interlibrary loan are not under the same library administration. Report loans provided to other libraries in item 62. Report loans received from other libraries in item 63.

REFERENCE REFERRALS (Items 64-65). Information requests sent from one library to another when the initiating library cannot answer a question or supply information. As in interlibrary loan the libraries involved are not under the same library administration. Report questions answered for other libraries in Item 64. Report questions referred to other libraries in Item 65.

PART IX -- TECHNOLOGY

The questions in this section should be answered for each library by circling the appropriate response.

59-2150

3-25-86

Cooperative Public Library Data System
Data Items

Note: Please see Instructions for information about what should be reported in each data item.

Name of Library:

Address of Library:

Part I -- General Information

	Number
1. Population of legal service area	
2. Registered borrowers	
3. Central library	
4. Branches	
5. Bookmobiles	
6. Other public service outlets	

Part II -- Library Staff

	No. of FTE
--Librarians	
7. --With master's degree from program accredited by ALA	
8. --With any other master's degree	
9. --Other persons holding title of librarian	
10. Total librarians	
11. All other paid staff (exclude plant operations and maintenance staff)	
12. Total paid staff (exclude plant operations and maintenance staff)	

Part III -- Library Income, by Source — Amount (Whole Dollars Only)

Source

13. Local government

14. State (exclude federal moneys distributed by state)

Federal (include federal moneys distributed by state)
15. --revenue sharing
16. --LSCA funds
17. --other federal
18. Other income (includes donations, interest, fines, etc)
19. Total income (includes items 13-18)

Part IV -- Library Expenditures

Section A. Standard Operating Expenditures

20. Salaries and wages (exclude plant operation and maintenance staff)

21. Employee benefits (exclude plant operation and maintenance staff)

Collection
22. --print materials (excluding serial subscriptions and microforms)
23. --serial subscriptions (include all physical formats)
24. --microforms (except serial subscriptions
25. --computer applications software
26. --machine-readable materials
27. --audiovisual materials
28. --other materials
29. Total expenditure on collection

30. Conservation

31. Plant operation and maintenance (include salaries and benefits)

32. Furniture and Equipment

33. All other operating expenditures

34. Total operating expenditures (includes items 20-33)

Amount (whole dollars only)

Section B.

35. Capital outlay

Section C. Selected Special Expenditures (included in A & B above)

Communications
36. --postage
37. --telephones and other telecommunications

38. Contracted computer services

39. Online database searching

40. Computer hardware

Part V -- Library Collection, Fiscal Year 19XX

Category	Held at End of Year	
	Physical Units	Titles
41. Books, Bound Serials and Government Documents (include bound periodicals and newspapers and exclude microforms)		
42. Government documents (if in separate collection)		
43. Microforms		
44. Audio materials		
45. Films		
46. Video materials		
47. Computer application software		
48. Machine-readable materials		
49. Other library materials		

	# of Subscriptions	# of Titles
50. Current serial subscriptions (includes periodicals and newspapers in any format		

Part VI -- Library Service Per Typical Week, Fall 19XX

	Number
51. Public service hours per typical week (do not count overlapping hours)	
52. Total attendance in library per typical week	
53. In-library use of library materials per typical week	
54. Total reference transactions completed per typical week	

Part VII -- Local Library Service, Fiscal Year

	Number
55. Public service hours, annual (count overlapping hours)	
Circulation transactions	
56. --Adult	
57. --Juvenile	
58. --Total circulation transactions	
Information service to groups	
59. --No. of programs/presentations	
60. --Total no. of persons attending programs/presentations	
61. Online database searches	

Part VIII -- Resource Sharing, Fiscal Year

	Number
Interlibrary loans	
62. --Provided to other libraries	
63. --Received from other libraries	
Reference referrals	
64. --Information requests answered for other libraries	
65. --Information requests sent to other libraries	

Part IX -- Selected Technology

66. Are microcomputers available to the public? Circle one: Yes No

67. If yes, circle one: free, fee, some fee, some free

68. Are online searches reported in line 61 provided free or with some charge at least some of the time?

Circle one: free, fee, some fee/some free

69. Does the library produce or participate in the production of television programs ? Circle one : Yes No

77-2773k 03-06-87

Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection
Instructions

Introduction

1. The purpose of this system is to ensure the collection of comparable data in all states. These data will be useful in the creation of a composite report on the public libraries of the United States by the national Center for Education Statistics. They will also be useful in state-to-state comparisons.

2. Data items and definitions have been specified for incorporation into state forms. A state form may very well request more data from libraries but only these data need be reported nationally.

3. Each state library agency is responsible for the quality of the data from libraries in that state. When the data are reported to the Center for Education Statistics some checks will be performed on the data, but state library agencies should "eyeball" what is reported to them before sending it to the Center and should perform machine edits if possible.

4. States will report data for each library in the state. A paper report is acceptable; machine-readable reports are preferable. The Center for Statistics uses IBM equipment but can handle compatibility problems.

5. The system will collect and report data for a single fiscal year. States may collect this data at different times because state fiscal years differ. In many states the FY is from July 1 to June 30 and statistics for the year are collected in the summer, but other states have different cycles. The national report will include data for a fiscal year, not data collected at one point in time but covering different fiscal years.

6. Where annual figures are requested, they should be figures from the most recent complete fiscal year. Where a simple count is requested, it should be accurate as of the end of that fiscal year.

7. Definitions are important to ensure comparability of data from different libraries and states. Definitions in these instructions should be incorporated into instructions sent out in each state. For the most part, these definitions were taken from the standard for library statistics approved in 1983 by the National Information Standards Organization (Z39).

8. Estimates are important if exact data are not available. Reporting libraries should not leave any items blank. They should enter "0" if the appropriate entry for an item is zero or "none" and enter "N/A" if an item does not apply to a particular library. If an exact figure is not available for a particular item but it is known that the amount is greater than zero, the librarian should ENTER AN ESTIMATE OF THE AMOUNT and indicate that the figure is an estimate by enclosing it in brackets.

9. State library personnel should encourage libraries to collect data in all catagories so that estimates will not be necessary in future years.

10. The cooperative system will include information on public libraries defined as follows: a public library is one that serves all residents of a given community, district, or region and (typically) receives its financial support, in whole or in part, from public funds. The exact determination of the libraries in a state to be considered "public" shall be the responsibility of the state library agency. Data on agencies which serve libraries but do not serve the public directly should NOT be reported to the cooperative system.

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION

This section requests information on the number of people served by the library and on public service outlets. Report figures as of the last day of the fiscal year.

POPULATION OF LEGAL SERVICE AREA (Item 1). The number of people in the geographical area for which a public library has been established to offer services and from which (or on behalf of which) the library derives income plus any areas served under contract for which the library is the primary service provider. THE DETERMINATION OF THIS POPULATION FIGURE SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY.

REGISTERED BORROWERS (Item 2). A registered borrower is a library user who has applied for and received an identification number or card from the public library which establishes the conditions under which the user may borrow materials. Do not report this figure unless the library has purged its file at least once within the last three years. If the library has household registration rather than or in addition to individual registration the state should report individuals by multiplying the number of households registered by the average number of persons in each household in the state.

CENTRAL LIBRARY (Item 3). The single unit library or the unit where the principal collections are kept and handled. Also called Main Library. Some county, multicounty and regional library systems may not have a main library. Some systems may have an administrative center which is separate from the principal collections and is not open to the public. This type of building should not be reported.

BRANCH LIBRARIES (Item 4). Branch libraries are auxiliary units which have all of the following: (1) separate quarters, (2) a permanent basic collection of books, (3) a permanent paid staff, and (4) a regular schedule for opening to the public. They are, however, administered from a central unit. Regional or divisional centers should be counted as branches.

BOOKMOBILE (Item 5). A truck or van especially equipped to carry books and other library materials and serve as a traveling branch library. Count vehicles in use, not stops.

OTHER PUBLIC SERVICE OUTLETS (Item 6). Include collections in nursing homes, jails, etc.

PART II - LIBRARY STAFF

Report figures as of the last day of the fiscal year. Include unfilled positions if a search is currently underway.

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES. To ensure comparable data 40 hours per week has been set as the measure of full-time employment in the Cooperative System. To compute full-time equivalents (FTE) of employees in any category, take the number of hours worked per week by all employees and divide it by 40. State library agencies may wish to include an example for local libraries to follow.

LIBRARIAN (Items 7-10). Persons reported under this category usually do work that requires professional training and skill in the theoretical or scientific aspect of library work, or both, as distinct from its mechanical or clerical aspect. The usual educational requirement is a master's degree (or its historical antecedent) from a library education program approved by the American Library Association. States should collect information about three kinds of persons with the title of librarian: persons with master's degrees from programs accredited by ALA; persons with any other master's degree holding the title of librarian; other persons holding the title of librarian.

ALL OTHER PAID STAFF (Item 11). Includes all other persons paid by the library budget except plant operation, security, and maintenance staff.

Note: states are free to collect information about staff in any way which satisfies local needs and accomodates local sensitivities. For national reporting, however, the distinctions made above should be observed.

PART III - LIBRARY INCOME

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SOURCES (Item 13). All tax and nontax receipts allocated by the community, district, or region of the public library and available for expenditure by the public library. Do NOT include here the value of any contributed or in-kind services and the value of any gifts and donations, fines, or fees.

STATE SOURCES (Item 14). All revenue from funds collected by the State and distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, except for federal monies distributed by the states.

FEDERAL SOURCES (Items 15-16). All revenue from funds collected by the federal Government and distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, including federal monies distributed by the states.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT (LSCA) FUNDS (Item 15). All funds from the LSCA distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries.

OTHER FEDERAL (Item 16). All revenue from the federal government other than that reported in Item 15 and distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, including such federal monies distributed by the state.

OTHER INCOME (Item 17). Report all income other than that reported in Items 13 through 16. Include, for example, gifts, donations, interest, fines, and fees. This amount is the difference between the sum of the income reported in Items 13 through 16 and the total income, reported in Item 18. Do NOT include the value of any contributed services or the value of "in-kind" gifts and donations.

PART IV - LIBRARY EXPENDITURES FROM ALL SOURCES

Part IV has been divided into three sections in order to facilitate reporting. All operating expenditures should be reported in Section A, Standard Operating Expenditures, which includes specific items that appear in most library operating budgets (Items 19-30). All other expenses should be reported in Item 31 so that Item 32 IS A TOTAL OF ALL OPERATING EXPENDITURES. Section B requests information on capital expenditures. Section C, Selected Special Expenditures, includes lines for expenditures which may appear in different places on different library budgets. (For example, online database searching may be considered under collection expenditures in some libraries. In others it may be reported under "other operating expenditures.") It is expected that amounts reported in Section C have already been reported in Section A or B. They are requested here, however, so that trends in these important areas may be documented.

Section A. Standard Operating Expenditures

OPERATING EXPENDITURES. The current and recurrent costs necessary to the provision of library service, such as personnel, library materials, binding, supplies, repair or replacement of existing furnishings and equipment, and costs incurred in the operation and maintenance of the physical facility. Note: local accounting practice shall determine whether a particular expense is operating or capital regardless of the examples in this definition.

SALARIES AND WAGES (Item 19). This amount should be the salaries and wages for all library staff except plant operation, security and maintenance staff for the fiscal year. Salaries for plant operation, security, and maintenance staff, if paid from the library budget, should be reported in Item 31. Include salaries and wages before deductions, but exclude "employee benefits."

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS (Item 20). The benefits outside of salary and wages paid and accruing to employees except plant operations, security, and maintenance staff, regardless of whether the benefits or equivalent cash options are available to all employees. Include amounts spent by the library for direct, paid employee benefits including Social Security, retirement, medical insurance, life insurance, guaranteed disability income protection, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, tuition, and housing benefits. If these benefits are not paid from the library budget mark N/A.

PRINT MATERIAL (Item 21). Material consisting primarily of words and usually produced by making an impression with ink on paper. Included in this category are materials that do not require magnification: books, bound periodicals, government documents, braille material, ephemeral print material, and the like.

SERIAL (Item 22). A publication issued in successive parts, usually at regular intervals, and, as a rule, intended to be continued indefinitely. Serials include periodicals (magazines), newspapers, annuals (reports, yearbooks, etc.), memoirs, proceedings, and transactions of societies.

MICROFORM (Item 23). A photographic reproduction of textual, tabular, or graphic material reduced in size so that it can normally be used only with magnification. The two main types of microforms are microreproductions on transparent material, including roll microfilm, aperture cards, microfiche, and ultrafiche, and reproductions on opaque material.

MACHINE-READABLE MATERIALS (Item 24). Report expenditures for both machine-readable data files and microcomputer applications software. Machine-readable data files are data files that exist in media such as punched cards, paper tape, magnetic tape and disks, digital videodiscs, and compact disks that are designed to be processed by a computer or other machine. Examples are U.S. census data tapes and reference tools on tape or disk. Do not count bibliographic records used to manage the collection. Microcomputer software contains instructions which direct the computer to perform some action. Examples are: Supercalc, dPaseIII or WordStar. Do not count microcomputer software used only by library staff.

AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS (Item 25). Library materials that are displayed by visual projection or magnification or through sound reproduction, or both, including graphic material, audio material, motion pictures, and video material; also the special visual materials such as cartographic and three-dimensional material.

OTHER MATERIALS (Item 26). Include all expenditures for materials not reported in Items 21-25.

TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON COLLECTION (Item 27). Give total of Items 21-26. If a library is not able to provide details requested in these items but can provide a total figure, it should be reported in Item 27.

PRESERVATION (Item 28). Activities associated with maintaining library and archival materials for use either in their original form or in some other usable way, including but not limited to binding and rebinding, materials conversion, deacidification, lamination, and restoration. Do not include salaries.

PLANT OPERATION, SECURITY, AND MAINTENANCE (Item 29). Activities concerned with keeping the physical plant open, safe, and ready for use. Includes cleaning, disinfecting, heating, lighting, communications, power, moving furniture, handling stores, caring for grounds, and other such housekeeping activities as are repeated somewhat regularly on a daily, weekly, monthly, or seasonal basis. Include minor repairs (e.g. broken windows). Include contractual costs and salaries and benefits of plant operation, security, and maintenance staff if paid from the library budget.

FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT (Item 30). Include expenditures for all furniture and equipment purchased during the fiscal year if they are not considered capital expenditures. May include microform equipment, audiovisual equipment and computer related equipment.

OTHER OPERATING EXPENDITURES (Item 31). Include all expenditures other than those given in Items 19-30. Include system operations software if it is not included in cost of hardware.

TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES (Item 32). Include Items 19-31.

Section B

CAPITAL OUTLAY (Item 33). Funds for the acquisition of or additions to fixed assets such as building sites, new buildings and building additions, new equipment (including major computer installations), initial book stock, furnishings for new or expanded buildings, and new vehicles. This excludes replacement and repair of existing furnishings and equipment, regular purchase of library materials, and investments for capital appreciation.
Note: Local accounting practices shall determine whether a specific item is a capital expense or an operating expense regardless of examples in the definitions.

Section C. Selected Special Expenditures

This section includes lines for expenditures which may appear in different places on different library budgets. (For example, online database searching may be considered under collection expenditure in some libraries and under "other operating expenditures" in other libraries.) It is expected that amounts reported in Section C HAVE ALREADY BEEN REPORTED in Sections A or B. They are requested here, however, so that trends in these important areas may be documented.

POSTAGE (Item 34). Include all expenditures for postage and delivery, including U.S. mail and commercial delivery services.

TELEPHONE AND OTHER FORMS OF TELECOMMUNICATION (Item 35). Include separately billed expenditures for all types of telephone service and for such services as electronic mail, teleconferencing, telefacsimile, teletype, and telex.

CONTRACTED COMPUTER SERVICES (Item 36). Include any costs related to purchased library services done for your library on computers by a computerized library network, a computerized cooperative library organization, or a commercial organization providing library services. Associated telecommunications costs may be included if they are not billed separately and reported in Item 35.

ONLINE DATABASE SEARCHING (Item 37). Costs of reference transactions in which the source utilized is one or more databases searched online by computer. Associated telecommunications costs may be included if they are not billed separately and reported in Item 35.

COMPUTER HARDWARE (Item 38). Include costs of computers, monitors, printers and other peripherals. Include system operations software if not billed separately.

PART V - LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, report for each item physical units held at the end of the year and titles held at the end of the year. Physical units are volumes, items or pieces. Titles are defined as follows: For reporting purposes, a title is a publication which forms a separate bibliographic whole, whether issued in one or several volumes, reels, discs, disks, slides, or parts. The term applies equally to printed materials, such as books and periodicals, as well as to audiovisual materials and microforms. Libraries should report the number of units and titles owned, both cataloged and uncataloged.

METHOD FOR ESTIMATING THE NUMBER OF TITLES IN THE COLLECTION:

1. For libraries with a shelflist on cards:
A library which does not maintain a title count of its various collections, and that cannot easily count the number of separate shelflist cards, should use the following method for estimating this count:

1. Pressing the cards tightly together, measure the total number of inches in the shelflist.
2. Using the same amount of pressure, measure one inch of cards in the shelflist. Count the number of titles contained in the inch.
3. Repeat step 2 at regular intervals (for example, count one inch in every foot, every three feet, or other pre-established interval) to ensure measuring at least seven sample inches distributed throughout the shelflist.
4. Average the number of titles per inch in the samples. If any sample varies from the average by more than four cards, repeat steps one through four, applying more even pressure to the cards.
5. Multiply the average titles per inch by the total number of inches of cards in the shelflist.

2. For libraries with an automated shelflist:

Most software systems include a method of determining number of titles. Libraries should use whatever method their software provides. If no method is available, an estimate should be made.

3. For uncataloged physical units, estimate number of titles.

BOOK (Item 39). A nonperiodical printed publication bound in hard or soft covers, or in loose-leaf format, of at least forty-nine pages, exclusive of the cover pages; or a juvenile nonperiodical publication of any length bound in hard or soft covers.

SERIAL (Item 39). A publication issued in successive parts, usually at regular intervals, and as a rule, intended to be continued indefinitely. Serials include periodicals (magazines), newspapers, annuals (reports, yearbooks, etc.) memoirs, proceedings, and transactions of societies. Except for the current volume, count unbound serials when the library has at least half of the issues in a publisher's volume.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT (Item 40). A government document is any publication in book, serial, or other form of library material that is published by a government agency, e.g. the publications of federal, state, local, and foreign governments and of intergovernmental organizations to which governments belong and appoint representatives, such as the United Nations, Organization of American States, and the Erie Basin Commission. If government documents are cataloged and shelved with the regular collection they should be reported in Item 39. If they are kept in a separate collection they should be reported in Item 40.Government documents in microform should be reported on line 41.

MICROFORM (Item 41). See definition for Item 23.

AUDIO MATERIAL (Item 42). A generic term for material on which sounds (only) are stored (recorded) and that can be reproduced (played back) mechanically or electronically, or both. This includes audiocassettes, audiocartridges, audiodiscs, audioreels, talking books, and other sound recordings.

FILMS (Item 43). The term film is used interchangeably with "motion picture" which is a length of film, with or without recorded sound, bearing a sequence of images that create the illusion of movement when projected in rapid succession (usually 18 or 24 frames per second). Motion pictures are produced in a variety of sizes (8, super 8, 16, 35, 55, and 70 mm) and a variety of formats (cartridge, cassette, loop, and reel).

VIDEO MATERIAL (Item 44). A generic term for material on which pictures, sound, or both are recorded. Electronic playback reproduces pictures, sounds or both using a television receiver or monitor.

MACHINE-READABLE MATERIALS (Item 45) See definition for Item 24.

OTHER LIBRARY MATERIALS (Item 46). Include all materials not already reported.

CURRENT SERIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS (Item 47). Report titles received both subscription and gift. Do not report number of individual issues. The total number of subscriptions in the library system, including duplicates, should be reported in the first column. The total number of individual titles, excluding duplicates, should be reported in the second column.

PART VI - LIBRARY SERVICE PER TYPICAL WEEK, 19XX

TYPICAL WEEK (Items 48-51). A typical week is a week in which the library is open its regular hours, containing no holidays. It is seven consecutive calendar days, from Sunday through Saturday, or whatever days the library is open during that period.

PUBLIC SERVICE HOURS PER TYPICAL WEEK (Item 48). Consider both main library and branches using the following method. If a library is open from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday, it should report 40 hours per week. If several of its branches are also open during those hours, the figure remains 40 hours. Should Branch A also be open one evening from 7:00 to 9:00, the total hours during which users can find service becomes 42. If Branch B is open the same hours on the same evening the total remains 42, but if it is open 2 hours on another evening, or from 5:00 to 7:00 on the evening when Branch A is open later, the total becomes 44 hours during which users can find service. Include bookmobiles if appropriate.

TOTAL ATTENDANCE IN LIBRARY PER TYPICAL WEEK (Item 49). Report the total number of persons entering the library per typical week including persons attending activities, meetings, and those persons requiring no staff services. It is recommended that libraries use the method described in Output Measures for Public Libraries, 2nd edition (ALA, 1987). If this is not available, the first edition of the same title may be used (ALA, 1982).

IN-LIBRARY USE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS PER TYPICAL WEEK (Item 50). Report the total number of materials utilized in the library, but not checked out. Include reference books, periodicals, book stock, and all other library materials that are used WITHIN the library. It is recommended that libraries use the method described in Output Measures for Public Libraries, 2nd edition (ALA, 1987). If this is not available the first edition of the same title may be used (ALA, 1982).

TOTAL REFERENCE TRANSACTIONS PER TYPICAL WEEK (Item 51). Report the total reference transactions per typical week. A reference transaction is an information contact which involves the knowledge, use, recommendations, interpretation, or instruction in the use of one or more information sources by a member of the library staff. The term includes information and referral service. Information sources include printed and non-printed materials, machine-readable data bases (including computer-assisted instruction), catalogs and other holdings records, and, through communication or referral, other libraries and institutions and persons both inside and outside the library. When a staff member utilizes information gained from previous use of information sources to answer a question, report as a reference transaction even if the source is not consulted again during this transaction.

Note: It is essential that libraries do not include directional transactions in the report of reference transactions. A directional transaction is an information contact which facilitates the use of the library in which the contact occurs and which does NOT involve the knowledge, use, recommendation, interpretation, or instruction in the use of any information sources other than those which describe that library, such as schedules, floor plans, handbooks, and policy statements. Examples of directional transactions include giving instruction for locating, within the library, staff, library users, or physical features, etc., and giving assistance of a non-bibliographic nature with machines.

PART VII - LOCAL LIBRARY SERVICE, FISCAL YEAR

PUBLIC SERVICE HOURS, ANNUAL (Item 52). Count both main library and branches using the following method. If the main library is open 60 hours per week (60 times 52 weeks = 3120), less 5 days of 10 hours each closed for holidays, the main library total is 3120 less 50 = 3070 hours. If 3 branch libraries are also open the same number of hours as the main library (regardless of whether or not all facilities are open at the same time), the annual aggregate for the library is 4 times 3070 = 12,280 hours. Include bookmobiles if appropriate.

CIRCULATION TRANSACTION (Item 53). The act of lending an item from the library's collection for use generally (although not always) outside the library. This activity includes charging, either manually or electronically, and also renewals, each of which is reported as a circulation transaction.

INFORMATION SERVICE TO GROUPS (Items 54-55). An information contact in which a staff member or person invited by a staff member provides information intended for a number of persons and planned in advance. Information service to groups may be either bibliographic instruction or library use presentations, or it may be cultural, recreational, or educational programs or presentations. Programs or presentations both on and off the library premises are included, as long as they are sponsored by the library. Does not include meetings sponsored by other groups using library meeting rooms.

ONLINE DATABASE SEARCH (Item 56). A reference transaction (see definition in Item 52 above)in which the source utilized is one or more databases searched online by computer.

PART VIII - RESOURCE SHARING, FISCAL YEAR

INTERLIBRARY LOAN (Items 57-58). An item of library material, or a copy of the material, is made available by one library to another upon request. It includes both lending and borrowing. The libraries involved in interlibrary loan are <u>not</u> under the same library administration. Report loans provided to other libraries in Item 57. Report loans received from other libraries in Item 58.

REFERENCE REFERRALS (Items 59-60). Information requests sent from one library to another when the initiating library cannot answer a question or supply information. As in interlibrary loan, the libraries involved are <u>not</u> under the same library administration. Report questions answered for other libraries in Item 59. Report questions referred to other libraries in Item 60.

PART IX - TECHNOLOGY

The questions in this section should be answered for each library by circling the appropriate response.

77-2772 03-06-87

Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection
Data Items

Note: Please see Instructions for information about what should be reported in each data item.

Name of Library:

Address of Library:

Part I -- General Information

	Number
1. Population of legal service area	
2. Registered borrowers	
3. Central library	
4. Branch libraries	
5. Bookmobiles	
6. Other public service outlets	

Part II -- Library Staff

	No. of FTE
Persons holding title of librarian	
7. --With master's degree from program accredited by ALA	
8. --With any other master's degree	
9. --Other persons holding title of librarian	
10. Total persons holding title of librarian (includes Items 7-9)	
11. All other paid staff (exclude plant operation, security, and maintenance staff)	
12. Total paid staff (exclude plant operation, security, and maintenance staff)	

Part III -- Library Income

Amount (Whole Dollars Only)

Source

13. Local government

14. State (exclude federal monies distributed by state)

Federal (include federal monies distributed by state)
15. --LSCA funds
16. --other federal
17. Other income (includes donations, interest, fines, etc.)
18. Total income (includes Items 13-17)

Part IV -- Library Expenditures From All Sources

Section A. Standard Operating Expenditures

19. Salaries and wages (exclude plant operation, security, and maintenance staff)

20. Employee benefits (exclude plant operation, security, and maintenance staff)

Collection
21. --print materials (exclude current serial subscriptions and microforms)
22. --current serial subscriptions (include all physical formats)
23. --microforms (except current serial subscriptions
24. --machine-readable materials (except current serial subscriptions)
25. --audiovisual materials
26. --other materials
27. Total expenditure on collection (includes Items 21-26)

28. Preservation

29. Plant operation, security, and maintenance (include salaries and benefits)

30. Furniture and equipment

31. All other operating expenditures

32. Total operating expenditures (includes Items 19-31)

	Amount (whole dollars only)
Section B.	
33. Capital outlay	
Section C. Selected Special Expenditures (included in A & B above)	
Communications	
34. --postage	
35. --telephone and other forms of telecommunication	
36. Contracted computer services	
37. Online database searching	
38. Computer hardware	

Part V -- Library Collection, Fiscal Year 19XX

Category	Held at End of Year: Physical Units	Held at End of Year: Titles
39. Books and serials (exclude microforms)		
40. Government documents in separate collection (exclude microforms)		
41. Microforms		
42. Audio materials		
43. Films		
44. Video materials		
45. Machine-readable materials		
46. Other library materials		

	# of Subscriptions	# of Titles
47. Serial subscriptions (includes periodicals and newspapers in any format)		

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

To: Advisory Committee
Cooperative System Project

October 24, 1985

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Questions related to proposed items and definitions

The plan for this project calls for a critique of the proposed form from each of the states chosen to participate. It is those comments which we will work with as we negotiate agreement on a common set of items and definitions.

However, I already know some of the issues that are liable to come up because of letters I received last fall after mailing the semi-final form to chief officers of state library agencies prior to the October'84 COSLA meeting at which we asked them to support the idea of cooperative data collection or because of letters or conversation with potential participants in the current project. I have described these issues below and hope we can discuss on November 8th.

1. Population of area served. Some states want this on the form; other states believe the figure is important but must be obtained from a more reliable source than the local librarian. What should we do about this matter? How do you deal with it in your state?

2. Librarian. Several states object to the second sentence of the definition which suggests that "the usual education requirement is a master's degree (or its historical antecedent) from a library education program approved by the American Library Association." Arguments against this sentence include: 1) it intimidates or insults people without the degree who are called "librarian" and are good at what they do, 2) some state regulations give the title to people who meet requirements other than the master's degree. One solution is to eliminate the offending sentence from the definition and add a question on the form about type of education. But we wanted to keep the staff section simple.

This is a serious dilemma; one which ALA often faces (but rarely admits!). If we adjust the definition to reality we will be critized by librarians who believe strongly that the word "librarian" should be used only for persons with specific professional education and commitment. If we insist on that professional education and commitment we will alienate many of the people who run public libraries - especially small ones. What to do?

3. Technology. Several states believe we should collect more detailed information them is suggested PART IV. Some like the grid we proposed in 'Notes" to the public library form in our report (see p 7 of the blue Form sent to you earlier).

4. Typical week measures (Part VII)

   a. Several states want a more specific definition of a typical week.

   b. Several suggest it will be very hard to get libraries to collect this data. Should we give up on these counts? Include them as optional?

5. Volunteers
   Several states want a count of volunteer staff. We avoided this earlier for many reasons. Should it be added to the national "core", or should the states that want it, collect it?

cc: Yvonne Carter

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

57-2052 February 14, 1986

To: Advisory Committee
Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection Project

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Possible changes in Items and Instructions

This memo raises several questions about things we might want to change in the Items and Instructions. I think we agreed that the green and grey sheets are "final" for the pilot test unless someone points out a major problem or suggests a clarification which seems vitally necessary. Otherwise we won't try to fix the system until the pilot test is complete. What do you think about the following:

A. Enclosed letter from George Smith (Alaska) which raises several questions. My suggestions for each are as follows:

7-9. Definition of FTE. We do suggest the state define FTE for that state. I don't think we can set a national figure here. George's comment reminds me, however, that someone suggested (Amy?) that we ask each state to report such things as: What is a full-time work week?, What source do you use for population figures?, What is the average family size? (for the household cards). We haven't yet described a way for states to do that? Do you have ideas about how to do it and what to ask?

7. Definition of Librarian. Here we go again! Seems to me we've got to live with the Z39 definition which is also endorsed by ALA. It defines librarian in terms of WORK DONE not the MLS (although the MLS is suggested as "usual"). Guess we must be clear that we are deliberately mushy on this point since it really is not up to us to define librarian. I don't know about the Alaska situation but I do know that Alaska is not the only place with lots of small libraries. Dare we suggest that the people who run them are not librarians--and infuriate the people who have been given that title, often by the state. On the other hand, can we call them librarians--and infuriate the people who stand firm behind the MLS. Do we want to reopen this question?

10. Local sources. Seems to me that we don't need to know all that at the national level. If the state finds it useful, however, the state should ask for it.

18-33. Expenditures.

a. I don't think we want a further breakdown of 18 and 19.

b. Nor do I like the idea of adding a line to identify professional expenses, etc. This would be nice to know but the form is too long now.

c. 20-27. I think we were aware of the need to have a place for libraries to report only one line for materials. That's why we included line 27. But George's comment here added to his comment on the number of small libraries in Alaska makes me wonder if we don't want to develop a "short form" for small libraries (similar to the IRS for small taxpayers). I just learned that Florida has done this and will investigate.

39-52 Library Collection. We considered a column for "added" but decided against it. To be meaningful you would also need a column for "withdrawn." Some states have both. I think we decided we did not need that much detail on the national level. Right?

64-65
66-67 I think George is right. Surely we meant same library administration.

B. Phone conversation with Colin Clark of California which raised these issues:

1. In Part III Library Income and Part IV Library Expenditures we should separate out LSCA. I don't completely understand why but I think it has to do with the fact that--on the Income side--LSCA funds must be matched and therefore should not be part of the total and--on the expenditure side--LSCA funds pay for special projects and therefore are not standard operating expenditures. Do you think I missed something? Is the situation unique to California?

2. In our definition of CONSERVATION (Item 28) we do not specify that salaries and benefits be included or excluded. I don't think we meant to include them but since this is just ahead of PLANT OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE which says salaries should be included we really need to say what we mean. I vote for excluding salaries from the conservation line. What do you think?

C. Comments made by the PLA New Standards Task Force when I showed them our "Instructions" in connection with a meeting on the Public Library Development Program about our definition of POPULATION OF LEGAL SERVICE AREA. Several people pointed out that the phrase "plus any areas served by contract" needed to be supplemented by the additional phrase "not also served by any other library." Evidently in some states laws or regulations exist which mandate a library to serve people who neither pay taxes nor belong to an area which has a contract with the library. As I understand it our intent is to have libraries report only the people it has an exclusive obligation to serve. We know most libraries serve others but for national comparability we need a firm rule for counting. Is it possible to provide a definition which will achieve that end?

cc: Yvonne Carter
Gerald Malitz

Enclosure

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

58-2119

February 26, 1986

To: Advisory Committee
Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Questions from Oklahoma on Items and Definitions

Yesterday I received a letter from Catherine Cook of Oklahoma reporting that she and Beverly Jones will not be able to come to the workshop since there is a "travel freeze" in the state of Oklahoma. She also included a list of questions she hoped we could resolve(copy enclosed). I talked to Cathy this afternoon and suggested answers which are given below. She is willing to accept whatever we decide and I told her I'd consult you before giving a final answer. Since people at the workshop may have similar questions I'd like your advice. Please let me know if you think my answers should have been different.

1. Capital outlay. Cathy isn't quite right about what appears in both definitions but there is a problem. Our definition on p 5 for EQUIPMENT (Item 30) says "Include expenditures for all library equipment..... and the definition on p6 for CAPITAL OUTLAY also mentions "new equipment." The latter definition was taken from Z39. I told Cathy I thought the difference would be whether the item was paid for out of funds for that fiscal year or "capitalized" and paid for over a period of years. She bought that but told me that the same object could be an operating expendure for one library and a capital expenditure in another, e.g. a library might buy a new vehicle out of operating funds though new vehicles are given as an example of CAPITAL OUTLAY.

Seems to me the deciding factor is the method of payment (i.e. at once or "capitalized" not the object of expenditure. If so we may need to modify the Z39 definition in some way. How about adding a sentence which reads:"Capital expenditures are not made in any one year but are spread out over a period of years." Or does that get us into some other trouble?

2. Salaries paid directly to employees, e.g. CETA. I told her those salaries are not library income and should not be counted in PART III. Likewise those employees are not "paid staff" since the library does not pay them and should not be counted in Part II. There is a problem, of course, of some libraries getting more work done because they have more hands to do it though those hands are not reported. But I think we'll just have to live with that. If everybody sticks to the same rules it will all wash out. NO?

3. Interest from local funds. I told her this goes with "other income" on line 16. Otherwise somebody would have to figure out how much interest comes from what source.

4. Periodicals. My first thought was that we should consider a complete volume as a "bound volune" even though it isn't really bound but we ask for a count of "physical units" on p 3 and twelve issues tied together are not one physical unit. Maybe we should have two sets of column headings--one for rows 39-40: Volumes/Titles and one for rows 41-51:Physical Units/Titles. How do you deal with this in your state?

5. Reference referrals. Pgs 298-299 of the May, 1985 issue of American Libraries will answer that question (copy enclosed). Don't know why Andy or I didn't think of using this article last fall when we were struggling with reference referral! I intend to copy it for all at the workshop.

6. Multi-county systems. Seems to me the unit reporting the income is the unit for which everything else is reported. Yes?

Re: my memo of February 14, p 2, item C: Just had a conversation with Nancy Bolt who was the member of the PLA New Standards Task force who questioned our definition of POPULATION OF LEGAL SERVICE AREA. Her concern is that a library or community might have contracts with several libraries all of whom would claim the related population. Since our intent was that a library claim people it served exclusively (at least as far as legal arrangements are concerned) suppose we change the last 6 words in the 1st sentence of the definition to read:plus population in an area without other library service which contracts with the public library completing the survey form.

Send me a message regarding these matters on ALANET if you can. Or I'll call. Hope to contact all of you about these questions before the workshop on March 13 and 14.

Enclosures (2)

Questions

1. Is buying a typewriter **capital outlay** or **equipment**? The phrase "repair or replacement of existing furnishings and equipment" appears in both definitions.

2. Does the **Other federal** category of income include the salaries paid by education/training programs like CETA which go directly to the employee?

3. **Local Government Sources** -- Does this include interest earned on these funds?

4. **Periodicals - Bound Volumes Only** -- Many of our libraries regularly keep five-year backfiles of periodicals, but do not bind them. Will these be counted in any way?

5. Does **Total Reference Questions** include interlibrary loan requests? How does this differ from **Reference Referrals**?

6. We need clarification for multi-county public library systems which have branches on what to aggregate.

Attachment #9

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

59-2147

March 17, 1986

To: Advisory Committee
Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Proposed revisions to Items and Instructions

Thank you to Amy and Jan and Pat for providing lots of moral, physical and intellectual support to a very successful workshop. Thank you Barratt for sending two very able representatives to the event. It was especially useful to have a professional demographer present for some of the discussion. Wes, I appreciated your moral support and regret that you had to miss the event. You would have enjoyed it.

I had hoped to enclosed proposed revisions of the list of list of data items and list of instructions but time was not available. Instead, I have described proposed changes in this memo. I am sending it to you so that I can get your "advice and consent" before incorporating them into the items and instructions and sending revisions to participating states.

By the time you get this I will probably have contacted you to set a time for a conference call on Friday, March 22 or Monday, March 24. In some cases I know what Amy and Jan and Pat think about the proposed changes; in other cases I'm not sure. In any case time may have made them think differently and it will be useful to talk together and with Barratt and Wes.

The rest of this memo describes the changes proposed for each part of the list of items and related instructions. Several questions related to all parts are raised at the end.

Part I. General Information

1. Population of legal service area. Last sentence in instructions should be put in caps to emphasize that it is up to the state to determine the population of legal service area. Approximately 50% of the states do this anyway for state forms. My earlier concern that one person might be claimed as a "capita" by more than one library makes no sense when in some states (Florida, New Hampshire) it is perfectly possible for persons to be taxed to support more than one public library. What we want for national comparability is the number of persons the library has an obligation to serve. The state agencies are very able to provide that in most cases. We will want to ask them to state source used and date of source as some will use the decennial census and others will have access to more up-to-date estimates.

[2. Registered borrowers. There was serious interest in dropping this. Several state representatives believe it is meaningless given the variety of practices regarding distribution of cards and weeding of files. Some wanted it, however, so we recommend leaving it in, at least for the pilot project.]

Part II. Library Staff

FTE is a problem but it seems that the only thing we can do it stick to the idea that that the reporting state decides. We might recommend the Texas practice of asking libraries to report hours and calculating FTE at the state agency. But then there is New Hampshire where full time = as many hours as the library is open--and many are open only 20 hours per week.

7. Librarians. Strong argument that we MUST do something to get more meaningful data here. It is nice to follow Z39 and ALA but we need to know the educational qualifications of the people running our public libraries. Some states need this information to justify consultants at the state level. Others would use it to argue for better funding for libraries. I suggest we change the items list so that it looks like this :

7. Librarians
   a. With master's degree from a program accredited by ALA
   b. With any other master's degree
   c. Other persons holding title of librarian
   d. Total librarians

The instructions would retain the Z39/ALA definition but would also add that persons with master's degrees from programs accredited by ALA should be counted on line 7a, persons with master's degrees from unaccredited library education programs and master's degrees in other fields should be counted on line 7b. and persons who have the title for any other reason should be counted on line 7c. I have discussed this with Margaret Myers and she thinks it would work. What do you think?

Part III. Income

There was a strong recommendation from the group that we drop the two columns (Operating Capital) In many states it is not easy to separate library income that way. We will know capital expenditures from Part IV.B. That should be enough information. Accordingly, the definition of operating should be moved to Part IV. A and the definition of capital dropped here. It is given again in definitions for Part B.

15. Gifts and Donations: drop this line incorporate concept into line 16. Other Income. Many questions came up about whether something was a "gift and donation" or "other income." The two have been combined in recent NCES reports. It seems more sensible to combine them then to complexify the definition and try to anticipate every possible "other."

16. Other income. Definition should be revised to incorporate gifts and donations. Also to be more specific about interest.

Part IV. Library Expenditures
Section A. Standard Operating Expenditures

Add definition of "operating expenditure"

18. Salaries and wages. Add: (exclude plant operation and maintenance staff)
The argument was that if you specifically include them in item 29 you should specifically exclude them in line 18.

19. Employee benefits. same as above

24. Machine-readable materials. Drop it. Confusing and "too soon" for most public libraries. If they do have any such they can be counted on line 26. This type of material should also be dropped as specific line in Part V.

28. Conservation. Mention in definition that salaries and benefits are not included

30. Change to "Furniture and Equipment" in items and instructions. This is the common phrase and is mentioned in the definition of operating expenditures we are using.

Section B. Capital Outlay

Mention in definition that whether or not an item is an operating expenditure or a capital expenditure depends on local accounting system not on examples in our definitions.

Section C. Selected Special Expenditures

35. change to "Telephones/telecommunications." Evidently some people don't think of telephones as telecommunications.

Part V. Library Collections

There was some discomfort with the column heading physical units" and many argued it is meaningless to count different forms of things (e.g. microforms, audio materials) and come up with a total. Guess we decided to keep the double columns since Z39 recommends it. This is something to watch in the pilot.

39. Books, Bound serials,etc. Some discussion of what to do about unbound periodicals tied with string or kept in boxes which many public libraries do for 3 or 4 years. Not discussed at workshop but in phone conversation with members of advisory committee following my memo about the letter from Oklahoma. I think we agreed that this is a mess no matter what we do but for national reporting we want only BOUND volumes, i.e. permanent additions to the collection. The instructions should be modified to explain that.

41-44. Strong desire to drop specific types of material in microform in the interest of simplicty. If public libraries can't provide it no sense asking them.

45. Changed to: Microforms

50. Machine-readable materials. Dropped. same reason as item 24.

Part VI. Library Services Per Typical Week, 19XX

Note removal of word Fall from title of this part. Makes no sense with our Fiscal Year emphasis.

53. Public service hours. Also line 57. Include bookmobiles in instructions.

Part VII. Local Library Service, Fiscal Year

61. Change to "No. of programs/presentations"
62. Change to "No. of persons attending programs/presentations"

Part VIII. Resource Sharing

Make it clear in definitions that libraries are not under same library administration.

Part IX. Technology

70. drop. redundant with line 63

71. Change to:"Are online database searches reported on line 63 provided free or with some charge? Circle appropriate response."

72. Strong desire to eliminate but if we must keep reword as follows: Does the library produce or participate in the production of television programs ?

Questions relating to several parts of form:

1. CETA employees. Could effect part II, Part III and Part IV. See my response to Oklahoma question. Have since learned that some states count money as federal income and count people as staff. We probably won't have to deal with this after Gramm-Rudman. What do you think?

2. How to deal with libraries that serve other libraries (service centers system headquarters) but are not open to the public. Seems to me they should be in a separate section of any report. But what about the problem that statistics from libraries without such support can't really be compared to those from libraries with it.

3. Estimates. Should they be in the national report at all? As real numbers or as something else? I have asked Sam Peng for his advice but what do you think.

cc: Yvonne Carter
Gerald Malitz
Barbara Cole

Attachment #10

Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection
Changes for 1987 data collection

Part I --General Information

Summary of changes:
Changes on Items list: Item 4
Changes in Instructions: Items 1,5,6

Introductory paragraph of Instructions: sentence added to indicate when figures should be provided. WHY? People asked whether figures should reflect first day or last day of fiscal year.

Item 1. Population of legal service area. Instructions modified: 1)by adding "for which the library is the primary service provider." WHY? To ensure comparability by excluding populations for which the library provides only partial service, 2) by dropping the last sentence WHY? No statistics should be reported to the Cooperative System for service centers or system headquarters which do not serve the public directly. This instruction has been added to #10 of the general instructions which precede the instructions for specific items.

Item 2. Registered borrowers. Instructions modified to place responsibility for reporting on library not on state agency. WHY? some state agencies want the change.

Item 4. 1)Change to "Branch Libraries" WHY? consistency with Instructions 2) Instructions modified by changing #3 to "a permanent paid staff" WHY? people asked if "paid" was implied. Since we agreed it is, we thought we might as well say it.

Item 5. Bookmobiles. Instructions modified by adding "in use" to last sentence. WHY? Someone asked if a library should count bookmobiles owned but not in use. We agreed such vehicles should not be reported.

Item 6. Other public service outlets. Instructions modified by changing "prisons" to "jails." WHY? Local libraries are more likely to serve jails than prisons.

Part II -- Library Staff

Heading above 7,8,9 and wording of Item 10 changed to "Persons holding title of librarian." WHY? This is a more logical heading for lines 7,8,9 and a more logical name for the total count. Since the meaning of the word "librarian" varies, all we know in this section is that we have a total of "persons holding the title of librarian."

Explanation of FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEES in Instructions: revised to simplify.

Item 11. Modified to add "security" staff. WHY? Someone asked if security staff were included with plant operations and maintenance. Since we agreed they were, we decided to specify. THIS ADDITION WAS ALSO MADE in instructions for Item 11 and in Items 12, 19 (was 20), 20 (was 21), 29 (was 31) and related instructions.

Part III- Library Income, By Source

Item 14 and heading for 15-17. Change "moneys" to "monies." WHY? Although the dictionary allows either, "monies" is favored.

old Item 15. --revenue sharing. Drop. This no longer exists.

Part IV- Library Expenditures From All Sources

Note addition to title: From All Sources WHY? To ensure consistency

Summary of changes:
Changes to Items list:Items 21,22,23, 24, 28, 35
Changes to Instructions: Items 22,24,28,29,34,35

Items 21(was 22), 22 (was 23), 23 (was 24). Add "current" before "serials" WHY? Specify that expenditures for current serials should be reported in Item 22. Current serials are excluded form the other two items but expenditures for backfiles might be included. This idea came from discussions with academic librarians and will make the public library form consistent with theirs. Because so much information is now released in current serials, an unambiguous expenditure figure is important.

Item 22 (was 23) Modify Instructions by adding word "(magazines)" after "periodicals" WHY? Small libraries think of periodicals as magazines. THIS CHANGE ALSO MADE IN INSTRUCTIONS WHEREVER DEFINITION OF "serial" IS GIVEN.

Item 24. Machine-readable materials. Incorporates old items 25 and 26. 1)Add "(except current serial subscriptions)" WHY? Some current serials are available in machine-readable form. 2) Modify Instructions so that this item includes computer applications software. THIS CHANGE ALSO APPLIES TO ITEM 45 which now includes old items 47 and 48.

Item 28 (was 30). Conservation. Change to Preservation. Modify instructions accordingly. WHY? Preservation is the preferred term. Includes conservation and more.

Item 29 (was 31). Modify last sentence of Instructions by adding mention of contractual costs.

Item 34. Postage. Modify Instructions by deleting last four words. WHY? Redundant

Item 35 (was 37). Change to --telephone and other forms of telecommunication. WHY? Better English.

Part V --Library Collection, Fiscal Year 19XX

Introductory "Note": 1)Modify to clarify that all materials should be counted both cataloged and uncataloged. WHY? Many public libraries have numerous uncataloged items. They are considered part of the collection and are probably reported anyway. 2) Delete definition of shelflist WHY? Unnecessary.

METHOD FOR ESTIMATING THE NUMBER OF TITLES IN THE COLLECTION:

1) add #3. on uncataloged materials. 2) modify comment #2 to clarify

Item 39 (was 41). Books, Bound Serials. . . . .. Drop unnecessary words. Modify Instructions by adding sentence to definition of serial that explains what to do with unbound volumes. WHY? Many public libraries keep complete but unbound volumes of serials. They probably count them anyway.

Item 40. Remove ( ) from "in separate collection." Add "(exclude microforms)" to Items list and add sentence to end of Instructions directing that government documents in microform should be reported in Item 41. WHY? clarifies possible confusion about whether government documents in microform should be reported with the type of publication (i.e. government document) or with the format (i.e. microform). ACRL and ARL favor the latter.

Item 43 (was 45) Films. Delete last sentence. WHY? Redundant.

Part VI -- Library Service per Typical Week, 19XX

Item 49 (was 52) Total attendance . . . Modify Instructions to specify use of Output Measures for Public Libraries, Second edition. WHY? To ensure comparability.

Item 50 (was 53). Same as above

Item 51. Modify Item and Instructions by dropping the word "completed" WHY? To avoid confusion. The word is not necesssary as the concept is implied in the definition of reference transaction.Also, the 2nd edition of Output Measures for Public Libraries defines "reference completion rate" as % of questions answered on day they were asked. Since this is not what we want, we should avoid the term "completed."

Part VII -- Local Library Service, Fiscal Year

Item 53 (was 56-58). Drop reference to Adult and Juvenile. WHY? Several reasons, including: 1)objections to word "juvenile," 2) complaint that circulation of "juvenile" is not good measure of service to children (others use J books, children use other books), 3) many libraries cannot provide this data.

Introduction to Instructions:

1. Change Center for Statistics to Center for Education Statistics. WHY? That is the new official name.

2. Add sentence to #10 (pg 2) WHY? To exclude service centers from the national report.

57-2034

Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection
Pilot Project Workshop
March 13 and 14, 1986

Objectives: (not in priority order)

* to provide information about the project and and advice on use of list of items to be incorporated into state forms and accompanying instructions
* to provide information on how to report to the Center for Statistics
* to provide an opportunity for sharing of information on gathering statistics from public libraries in a state (includes public relations, construction of questionnaire, use of computers)
* to build a team of state library personnel committed to the idea of a national system of public library statistics based on reporting from states
*to gather information about problems participants anticipate with using list of items and set of instructions

Tentative Schedule

Thursday March 13, 1986

3:00 to 6:00 Burrell Hall, St James Cathedral

3:00 to 3:30 Introductions, housekeeping

3:30 to 3:45 Overview of the Pilot Project (what preceeded it, why it was started, what sponsors and participants hope to achieve)

3:45 to 4:15 Items and Instructions (presentation and group discussion)

4:15 to 4:30 Coffee, tea, coke

4:30 to 6 Integrating items and instructions into existing forms
Amy Owen (Utah)
Gail McKenzie (Indiana)
Walter Terrie (Florida)
*discussion

6:30 Dinner in ALA Staff Lounge (pizza, salad, wine, cookies)

7:30 to 9:00 How to persuade librarians to respond fully and quickly

9:00 Adjournment for participants
Debriefing for committee (Lynch, O'Donnell, Fey-Stukas, Giambrone, Owen, Smith)

Friday, March 14

Breakfast on your own

All day in Burrell Hall, St James Cathedral

8:15 Committee planning session

9:00 to 9:10 Housekeeping (coffee will be available)

9:10 to 10:00 Designing Forms
*Graphics advice from Natalie Wagrin
*Data entry advice from Walter Terrie
*Discussion

10:00 to 10:15 Coffee Break (more coffee, also rolls)

10:00 to 11:00 Using Computers to manage data collection and reporting
*Walter Terrie-overview
*Gail McKenzie about Indiana
*Pat Smith about Texas

11:00 to 12:00 Validating data
*Amy Owen on eyeballing
*Pat Smith on machine editing

12:00 to 1:00 Lunch catered in Burrell Hall

1:00 to 1:30 Reporting to the Center for Statistics (what is needed)

1:30 to 2:30 What this system could do for the public library community
*Panel Discussion- Members of Advisory Committee

2:30 to 3:30 Optional
*This session is designed to allow participants to consult with resource people and/or work with each other on matters of common concern.

3:30 to 4:00 Wrap-up:
*What should Principal Investigator and Advisory Committee do to help participants?
*What can participants do to ensure possibility of national system?
*Any other questions?

4:00 Adjournment

Proceedings of the Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection Pilot Project Workshop, March 13 and 14, 1986. American Library Association. Office for Research. Chicago, Illinois

Thursday, March 13, 1986

INTRODUCTIONS

Tom Galvin, Executive Director of ALA, welcomed the particpants and spoke about ALA's interest in and support of this project. Peggy O'Donnell, the facilitator of the workshop, introduced herself and said that her role was to introduce speakers, lead the discussions and keep the workshop on schedule. O'Donnell then asked the participants to introduce themselves and to tell the group where they were from and their reason(s) for particpating in this project. (See last page for list of participants.) Some of the reasons the participants gave were as follows:

-to learn about research applications of statistics
-to create a better state data base of public library statistics
-to produce reliable public library statistics
-to produce statistics comparable to those of other states
-to use statistics in new ways

Several members of the group told how they inherited the job of collecting public library statistics. They were doing the best job that they could, but they hoped this workshop and the pilot study would enable them to collect statistics more efficiently and use them more effectively.

BACKGROUND OF PROJECT

Mary Jo Lynch, Director of the ALA Office for Research (OFR) and principle investigator of the project gave a short history. During 1983-1984 OFR analyzed the collection of data from academic, public, and school libraries by state library and educational agencies and by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), now called Center for Statistics (CS). This project, funded by NCES, produced the report entitled, ANALYSIS OF LIBRARY DATA COLLECTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PLANS FOR THE FUTURE. One of the recommendations of the report was that since most state libraries collect statistics from public libraries every year, NCES should coordinate their individual efforts. The individual states would then produce comparable data annually so that a national report could be produced in less time than it has taken in the past (statistics for 1982 were published in 1986).

OFR presented the idea for a cooperative system of data collection to the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA), which approved the idea. OFR then sent an unsolicited proposal to the Department of Education and funding was approved. OFR sent letters to the fifty states anouncing the pilot study and inviting them to participate. Twenty-five states responded.

Several of these states had to drop out because of unexpected events. Eventually, nineteen states officially joined the project. Fourteen states were represented at the workshop.

NOTES ON THE PILOT PROJECT

1. Originally, seven states were going to be chosen for the pilot study. However, OFR and the Advisory Committee decided to include all volunteer states.

2. The project will collect statistics for fiscal year 1986 (FY86). Since many states have fiscal years at different times during the calendar year (for example: July to June; September to August), the data from each state will be sent to Center for Statistics at different times during the year. It would be ideal if all states could use the same fiscal year but since states will probably not change their fiscal years to accomodate the project, this seems the best solution right now.

3. OFR and the project Advisory Committee developed a list of items to be reported to the Center. The states in the project study will incorporate the data items into their forms. States may add other items which will not be reported. States may also rearrange the items to suit local requirements.

4. This is a pilot project. As the project progresses, it may be neccesary to change certain aspects. One of the objectives of the pilot is to find out what will work and what will not, so that the cooperative system can be run effectively and efficiently on a larger scale.

5. Participants will receive a report about the workshop summarizing the discussions, major concerns, possible problems, and solutions that were raised at the workshop.

6. ALA will send out a news release about the workshop. Also, there will be a meeting for participants and others interested in this project at the ALA Annual Conference on Saturday, June 28, 11:30am-12:30pm.

GROUP DISCUSSION OF DATA ITEMS

The purpose of this discussion was to allow the group to raise general concerns about the list of data items so that problems could either be solved or be included in the pilot project report. Concerns noted are described below.

A. Population Served

There are several populations that the states have to be aware of:

1. the legal service area
2. the registered borrowers
3. the population actually served
4. the unserved population

The best source of information on the legal service area is the state census bureau. It was recommended that the state libraries contact the state census bureau for these figures rather than asking the libraries to supply it.

The actual number of registered borrowers is a problem because according to the Z39 standards, the file of registered borrowers should be purged every three years. If libraries do not do this, they will have more borrowers on record than actual borrowers. If some libraries do not purge their files and others do, then these figures are not valid for comparisons.

Many libraries claim their service population is greater than their legal population and greater than their registered borrowers. Users may come from other towns to use the library. However, there does not seem to be an easy way to determine this figure. Libraries would have to perform a census of their users to find this figure. This does not seem practical.

Other concerns regarding population figures are listed below:

1. How should states count their population unserved figures? What should states do with these figures?

2. Some states allow double counting of service populations for legitimate reasons. In Florida, for instance, the population served figure is greater than the actual population of Florida because some people pay taxes to support both a county library and a city library. In New Hampshire a town may have more than one library supported by public funds.

3. What do the problems with registered borrowers or estimated service population mean for per capita library statistics, or measures of library service, such as Output Measures for Public Libraries? If these population counts are not comparable from library to library then per capita comparisons are not valid either.

4. As the decade progresses the federal census figures may become invalid for certain regions or states. What if state estimates are not available? Also, how can libraries compare legal service areas if some states continue to use federal census figures and other states use their own annual estimates?

B. Definition of librarian

Some states define the position of a librarian by state law; other states do not. Again this is the problem of comparing items that have different meanings from state to state. One participant noted that however the profession defines librarian, someone will object.

C. Definition of library

The discussion of the definition of a librarian raised the issue of what constitutes a library. Again, states vary. Some states require a board of governers, an ordinance establishing the existence of the library, and ongoing local government support. Some states collect statistics on "nonpublic" libraries, such as women's clubs, but do not publish these statistics in their annual reports.

D. Operating income vs. capital income

Some libraries distinguish between these types of income and others do not. Basically, libraries have to report their sources of income according to the locally established accounting principles. Eventually the group agreed to drop the headings "capital" and "operating" in the section of the items list on income.

E. Defintion of a full-time employee

Some libraries use a 35 hour work week, others use a 40 hour week. Thus, the meaning of full-time equivalent (FTE) differs from library to library. In one state if a library was open for only 20 hours a week and the librarian worked for 20 hours a week, she was considered to be a full-time employee.

INTEGRATING ITEMS AND INSTRUCTIONS INTO EXISTING FORMS

Three participants presented this topic.

A. Amy Owen (Utah)

The process of incorporating the list of data items into Utah's form was as follows:

1. Compare state form with the list of data items.
2. Make decisions, list options.
3. Integrate forms, following the basic outline of the list of data items.

B. Gail McKenzie (Indiana)

Gail McKenzie discussed some of the problems she encountered as she tried to incorporate the data items into Indiana's form.

1. Book collection: Had to make distinction between physical units and titles.
2. Library service hours per typical week: Libraries may not know how to do this.
3. Operating vs. capital expenditures: In Indiana land, building, equipment, book purchases are all considered capital expenditures.

Walter Terrie (Florida)

Walter Terrie emphasized that the people incorporating the data items into the form should think of the person who will have to answer it, a person who is probably overworked and underpaid. He gave the following recommendations:

1. Keep the forms short and simple. Terrie said that he fights to keep items out of the form. Make sure you really need a piece of information before you ask it. Do not collect items that you would just like to know something about. If you place less burden on your respondents the quality of their responses is likely to improve.
2. Florida has two forms, a long form and a short form. Libraries that receive state aid must fill out the long form. The short form is sent to small libraries that do not receive state aid and that have not responded to the long form. Florida used the short form for the first time last year (1985) and was pleased by the return rate.
3. Terrie suggested that the state forms should include needed definitions. Florida tries to provide the definition in the question that asks about a particular data item. Do not make your respondents look somewhere else to find out what they should do. He admitted that it might not be possible to include all the necessary definitions on the form. In that case, you can include a set of instructions, but make it clear that the respondent should use them only if confused about a question. Again, the guiding principle is make the form easy to fill out.
4. The data item for microforms should ask for only a total figure for microforms, not one that is broken down into books, serials, other and so on. The libraries probably do not know. But if you do ask, you <u>will</u> get a figure--even if it is a wild guess.
5. Libraries do not know the population of their service area. Florida uses state reports.
6. Legal vs. actual service population. It is not feasible for libraries to determine their actual service populations. Better to use legal service population as this figure can be supplied by an official source.

Suggestions made by particpants:

1. Do not use a committee to incorporate the list of data items into your state form. Do it by yourself. The committee will never reach a consensus, whereas if you present them with a form, they will probably approve it.

2. A count of titles of microforms is a meaningful figure; however, a count of physical units is not, unless you are concerned with physical space. Most people are more interested in titles than physical units.

3. In order to get comparable data, the state forms should ask the same questions in the same way. Otherwise the information will be only roughly comparable. Despite this, the information that this pilot project will collect and the manner in which it will be collected is a big improvement over previous methods.

HOW TO PERSUADE LIBRARIANS TO RESPOND FULLY AND QUICKLY

After a dinner break, the group discussed various problems with collecting statistics from public libraries and possible solutions.

A. Incentives which may inspire response

1. Make state aid contingent upon filling out the state forms. The group agreed this was the best incentive.
2. Give the libraries something they can use in return for their efforts.
3. Use the statistics in planning and budgeting. Hold workhops so libraries can learn how to do this. Or provide consultants to help individual libraries.
4. Publicize success stories of libraries that have used statistics to their benefit.
5. Provide salary information on library positions for different regions throughout a state, especially information on small libraries which are not covered by the ALA salary survey. Many libraries want local information and are interested in the salaries in their own area, state, and bordering states.
6. Regional directors should encourage libraries to fill out the reports and should help libraries if necessary.
7. Give workshops on state aid and include the importance of providing statistics and their use.
8. Develop other types of teaching tools to help libraries use statistics, such as audio or video aids.
9. Let libraries know they have a deadline. One participant referred to this as the squeaky wheel theorem. Keep soliticing for the form. If you make enough noise they will answer the form. A last resort might be to send a letter to the president of the library board.
10. Send out a preliminary draft listing respondents. It will be obvious who is not on the list. This technique combines embarrassing the library plus peer pressure.
11. Preliminary drafts of results should be regarded with caution. It is possible that unchecked figures could be used in planning and budgeting.
12. Smaller libraries are intimidated by long forms. Offer them personal help either on the phone or with a visit. Encourage them, let them know their responses are important.
13. Take a sample of libraries in the state instead of requiring every one to respond.
14. Produce the final report as soon as possible. Libraries cannot use what they do not have.
15. Train librarians in the use of statistics. Florida did this but the response was poor.
16. If you want to collect data on special items, ask about one or two every year. Do not overload the form.

B. Problems which inhibit response

The major one is a matter of attitude. Some libraries believe they are doing the state library a BIG favor by filling out the form; they are so good that they do not need to fill out the form. They are not interested in comparing themselves with other libraries because they know they are the best.

C. Publicizing statistics:
1. Statistics can be used as ammunition for budget or wage increases.
2. Libraries should use statistics selectively. If a statistic does not help you do not publicize it.
3. Publicizing statistics can backfire sometimes:
   a. Libraries at the top may not like being in spotlight. Libraries at the bottom may not like it either.
   b. Government officials may realize what it costs for many small libraries to operate and cut funding. (Most group members disagreed with this. They wanted officials to know because the cost could be used for arguments to create fewer but larger and better supported libraries.)

Friday, March 14, 1986

DESIGNING FORMS

Natalie Wagrin, a free-lance artist who does graphic design for ALA, gave the particpants advice on how to design state forms. Wagrin said that you should make forms as easy to work with as possible since, by their very nature, forms tend to put people off. Your audience recognizes poor quality. They will be annoyed at having to fill out such a form. It will also be harder for you to pick out the information you need. Wagrin suggested two ways to improve the quality of forms:

1. work with a forms designer
2. use basic design techniques on your own

Designing an attractive form takes time and planning. If you are working with a designer allow more time than if you were doing it yourself. A designer can help you work with word processing equipment or typesetting. A designer is a trained, outside eye whose experience and objectivity can help you improve your form. To find a designer, check the yellow pages or local colleges with fine arts departments, or ask people in your own organization whom they work with. A designer will prepare "roughs," drafts of what the form will look like. You can also request a systems design. The designer will then indicate various design specifications, such as styles and size of type, which you can use when you want to change the form. One way to help the designer is to keep a file of forms you like or do not like. That way the designer sees what you want.

There are several things you can do by yourself to improve the layout of your form:

1. Use "rules," strips of black tape of varying widths, to mark off sections.
2. Use a consistent pattern of type, underlining, boldfacing, and so on for the same purpose.
3. Do not mix horizontal and vertical tables. Try to reformat them so they are consistent.

Wagrin then showed how she redesigned two pages of a state's form (Arkansas) by using the methods she suggested. Participants agreed that the form looked easier to understand and asked to have copies of it. One participant asked if it was better to make a booklet out of the form or to keep it in single sheets. Someone answered that single sheets were easier to insert in a typewriter. Also, since repsondents are likely to use a typewriter, keep in mind the vertical spacing on the form. However, photocopying a form generally reproduces it to 98% of size, so this may affect vertical spacing. Finally, if you experiment with colors of paper, remember that certain colors reproduce poorly in photocopying.

USING COMPUTERS TO MANAGE DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

Walter Terrie provided an overview of the process. He suggested two ways to make filling out the forms easy for your respondents:

1. For short forms, put as many questions as you can on a sheet. Each question should have several subquestions. If you ask 10 questions, each with 4 subquestions, you have asked 50 questions. These questions must be the kind that respondents can check or circle yes or no, or choose from a list of given answers. Although this technique cannot be used with long state forms, participants may be able to use it for collecting other kinds of information.

2. For long forms, add as much space as possible. This makes it easier both to enter and retrieve data. Remove any unneccessary coding on the form. As long as questions are numbered clearly it should be possible to refer to them without confusion.

Terrie then described the process of collecting and reporting data in Florida. He described the pros and cons of using fixed versus free fields. He also pointed out that each agency has to determine how it will represent a missing value, which is not to be confused with the number zero given as an answer. Florida uses the following numbers, each preceded by a negative sign to indicate these values:

-1 no answer
-2 library does not keep a record
-3 not applicable

How the state represents missing values is not important. But it is important to represent them consistently and to document the procedure.

Terrie then described how he would collect the data if he could do things the way he wanted. He would use a microcomputer with database software that had forms capability. The computer represents the form on the screen, or enough of it to make sense, and the cursor jumps from field to field as someone enters data.

Gail McKenzie described how Indiana has been collecting and reporting data. She has used an IBM mainframe since 1979 with SAS software (Statistical Analysis System). The programs she has created allow the computer to supply the previous year's information. In addition to supplying information that

does not change yearly, such as the library's address, this allows libraries to see the figures they supplied the previous year. The computer also checks totals and subtotals. Finally, she can provide libraries with custom reports on specific data items. Indiana has five years of data on tape that it may begin to use for trend analysis.

Pat Smith described the experience of Texas with data collecting and reporting. Texas has used many programming languages and continues to experiment. COBOL and FORTRAN were discontinued because they were inflexible--changes required major reprogramming. Like Indiana, Texas uses SAS now. It may use SAS/PC (SAS for microcomputers) depending on the cost and other administrative problems yet to be worked out.

Smith suggested the following techniques for validating data:

1. Test software program before each use. The program may have been altered intentionally or unintentionally since it was last used.
2. Create a database of the statistics and use them to generate specific reports, rather than rekeying certain data items each time a report is needed.
3. Write software to automatically check accuracy of data. These can be simple addition checks or more sophisticated programs that will compare total income versus total expenditures, etc.
4. Use two separate keypunchers to enter identical data. The computer should compare the separate data and generate a list of discrepancies.
5. Compare current data to last year's data. Write software that will detect percentage variance and flag you if the variance is beyond an acceptable range.
6. Run parallel programs if you have done any revising. Comparing the old program with the new program will allow you to detect any bugs.
7. Review output for "Rules of Thumb." If you know certain questions are often misinterpreted, check that question. (Better yet rewrite the question.) Use your professional judgement and scan reports. Do figures make sense from your past experience?
8. Proofread data before it goes to press for last time. There is no computer that can do this for you.

Walter Terrie responded to Gail McKenzie's remark that she would like to link her library statistics with federal census data. The tapes that summarize census information are released three or four years after the census is taken. If you want to use this information be aware that it is three or four year old when "new," and becomes older as the decade progresses. Terrie also mentioned that SAS/PC and SPSS/PC can run only if the PC's memory and storage capacity have been greatly upgraded. It probably would be cheaper to buy a more powerful PC, than to try an upgrade a 128K PC, for example.

Jean Feye-Stukas (Minneapolis) asked participants to provide rough estimates of staff time devoted to collecting and reporting the statistics.

Participants wrote their estimates for the following procedures:

Forms design
Preparing and sending out forms
Data entry
Validating data
Preparing final report
(professional, technical, and clerical staff)
Estimated cost of contracted computer service for compiling statistics

REPORTING DATA TO THE CENTER FOR STATISTICS

Particpants raised their concerns about how they would report data and problems that the study should try to resolve.

1. Computer related questions:
   a. What type of field delimiter must be used?
   b. How should missing values be represented?
   c. Does CES want data on hard discs, soft discs, etc?
2. How can states avoid double counting
   a. population figures
   b. money transferred from administrative headquarters to individual libraries

VALIDATING DATA

Amy Owen led the group in an exercise to practice quality control on a sample form by using their common sense and professional judgement. Participants broke up into small groups and checked the sample form. Each group then shared its findings with the others.

Sources of Error	Solution Techniques
1. Definitions provided are unclear	1. Improve definitions
2. Math: errors in subtotals or totals; wrong units provided	2. Audit math
3. Figures do not make sense.	3. Expert review: knowledge of local library and its situation. Test figures against your experience with similar libraries. Check common problems such as reporting FTEs. Check against last year's report. Cross-check figures for internal consistency.

Other considerations for validating data

1. Educational level of respondent
2. Attitude of library towards filling out form
3. Adequacy of local record keeping
4. How good do you want your data to be? Data are expensive. How much time can you and your staff spend on checking accuracy?

SUGGESTIONS/QUESTIONS REGARDING THE NATIONAL SYSTEM

1. Report shoud provide a finer breakdown of libraries by population served figures. The following categories were suggested:
   - 1,000 and under
   - 2,500 and under
   - 5,000 and under
   - 10,000 and under
   - 25,000 and under

2. Should system collect information on very small units of service? Should states collect data from very small libraries for their own information but not report this nationally?

3. Should system provide a national definition of a public library? Should each state report its own definition?

4. Should system help libraries to interpret statistics and use them for planning, self-evaluation?

5. Should appendix of report contain state definitions of a public library? or the source of population figures in each state?

6. Should report provide information on:
   a. administrative units that provide service to public libraries but not to the public?
   b. systems and regions
   c. state library services
   d. multistate regions (using geographical divisions of federal census)
   e. large public libraries by number of service outlets, and figures for population served per outlet

7. Should report compile data on employee benefits?

8. Should report group libraries by headings other than population figures, such as by total expenditures?

9. Can system create a database which can be searched for specific inquiries? Can information be downloaded by libraries for their own analysis?

WHAT CAN THE OFFICE FOR RESEARCH AND THE PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DO?

1. Provide a list of pointers for validating data.
2. Resolve issue of data items quickly.
3. Provide specifics for reporting data, especially for those using computers.
4. Provide a report summarizing workshop.
5. Provide a "model form" designed by ALA.
6. Resolve issue of deadlines for states to report to CS. What is a reasonable cutoff date? Can a state provide partial data?

WHAT CAN PARTICIPANTS DO TO HELP SYSTEM WORK?

1. Send data in on time
2. Cooperate with the CS

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Three groups formed so participants could share their interests and problems with each other:

1. those interested in the the list of data items
2. those interested in techniques of validating responses
3. those interested in using microcomputers to collect data

Conclusion

The workshop ended after this discussion. Some members remained to discuss the list of data items. Participants were glad to have had the chance to share their experiences with each other. There was talk of forming a group of those people interested in public library statistics to meet at ALA conferences.

Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection
Pilot Project Workshop
March 13-14, 1986

Participants
(in order by state)

Keith Lance, Project Director
Long Range Planning for Libraries
Colorado State Library
1362 Lincoln
Denver, CO 80203

Maureen Crocker
Colorado State Library
1362 Lincoln
Denver, CO 80203

Rose Harrison
Connecticut State Library
231 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

Virginia Griggs
State Library of Florida
R.A. Gray Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Walter Terrie
Center for Population Studies
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dotty Hiebing
State Library of Iowa
Historical Building
Des Moines, IA 50319

Ann Joslin
Associate Director, Library Development
Idaho State Library
325 West State St.
Boise, ID 83702

Gail McKenzie
Library Statistics Coordinator
Extension Division
Indiana State Library
140 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Martha Roblee
Indiana State Library
140 N. Senate Ave.
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Jan Feye-Stukas
Library Specialist II
Library Development and Services
440 Capitol Square
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101

Judith A. Kimball
Director of Extension and Library Development
New Hampshire State Library
20 Park Street
Concord, NH 03301

Matthew Higgins
New Hampshire State Library
20 Park Street
Concord, NH 03301

Richard Palmer
Deputy State Librarian
Ohio State Library
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Barbara Cole
Administrator, Subsidies & Grants
Library Development Division
State Library of Pennsylvania
Box 1601
Harrisburg, PA 17105

When can CS expect to receive FY 86 statistics from the majority of libraries in your state?

(Chronological Order)

Earliest Date	State	Most likely Date
8/86	South Carolina	10/86
9/86	Alaska	10/86
10/86	Olkahoma	10/86
10/86	Oregon	11/86
10/86	Iowa	12/86
10/86	California	12/86
10/86	Wyoming	1/87
1/87	Idaho	3/87
4/87	Ohio	4/87
4/87	Indiana	5/87
4/87	Colorado	6/87
4/87	Utah	6/87
5/87	Minnesota	7/87
7/87	Washington	8/87
7/87	New Hampshire	9/87
8/87	Florida	9/87
9/87	Pennsylvania	10/87

September 1986

Attachment #14

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

65-2425

July 25, 1986

To: Participants in Pilot Project
Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Update

I. Meeting at Annual Conference (Saturday, June 29)

Twenty persons signed the attendance list and several others were also present for part of the meeting. Thirteen attendees were from participating states. Ten states were present (three states had two attendees).

The meeting began with MJL's elaboration on the handout headed "Pilot Project Summary" which was distributed with the memo of 6/17. PLEASE NOTE that two dates on that handout should be corrected: the answer to "When did it start?" should be October 1, 1985 and the answer to "When will it finish?" should end with a prediction that the statistical report will be published in early 1988.

Next the ten participating states present gave status reports on what is happening locally. In general things are going well. Librarians are accepting the revised forms and the change is not overly disruptive at the state library agency.

Then participating states and visitors raised several issues for discussion. Richard Cheski from Ohio asked what will happen next, i.e. will a useful report be published promptly (The project Advisory Committee discussed specifications for the report on Monday 6/30. They are talking about recommending a report with tables similar to summary tables in the Statistics of Public Libraries, 1981-82 and publication of detailed data on floppy disks that are compatible with a major software package and also have enough programming to yield simple data without additional software).

Other concerns were:

-What population should be reported when the population fluctuates as it does in New Hampshire resort communities? Colorado suggested asking libraries to supply two population figures: the population of the legal service area and whatever other figure the library believes is served with documentation of that belief. The Colorado solution is probably useful on the state level but it doesn't solve the problem for the Cooperative System. What population should be reported. I'd say the year-round population of legal service area. But those summer people do make service demands, add to circulation, etc. Any suggestions???

-How is this project related to the Public Library Development Project? Answer from MJL: Very closely. I am on the study team and have insisted that definitions and concepts from the Cooperative System list of Items and Instructions be incorporated when appropriate.

-What influence does system membership have on the meaning of data reported to the Cooperative System? (See III E. below)

II. Reporting FY data to the Center for Statistics

The summary charts sent with my memo of 6-17 shows how and when states will report. Below is a summary of current plans.

A. Floppy disks. 9 states will send 5 1/4 floppies. 5 of them planned to use Lotus 1/2/3 when the chart was done and Jan Walsh told me at Conference that Washington will use Lotus also. Dick Palmer of Ohio is working with the Lotus users to standardize the record layout. Would this information be useful to others planning to send floppies?

B. Magnetic tape. 4 states will send magnetic tape. Indiana did a record layout which has been shared with the other three and with Dick Palmer.

C. Photocopies of forms. Four states were to report in this way when the list was done. Will be three if Washington can use Lotus. I'm hoping to find a way to have data entered into a computer either at ALA or in some other state so that a floppy can be sent to the Center.

III. Problem Areas

A. Issues raised in the letter from Colin Clark. I heard from Libby Law (South Carolina) but no one else has sent anything or said anything. The technical report I'll write in September will comment on those issues. Does anyone else have any reactions?

B. Government Documents

I had lunch with one of the GODORT leaders who suggested we change how we deal with government documents on the items list. Since most public libraries are not depository libraries she believes most public libraries have government documents either in the regular collection or in the vertical file. For them, our lines 41 and 42 are confusing. On the other hand, depository libraries may not know how to report fully. She suggests we do this:

	Phys Units	Titles
41. Books and Bound Serials	(include ....)	

For depository libraries only:
42. Government documents in separate collection
  a. Paper
  b. Microform

This makes sense to me for three reasons:

1. A separate line item for government documents was not part of the NCES public library form in the past. When we suggested it at the end of the earlier project it was because it was a line item on the academic form and we were trying to make the two as similar as possible.

2. Only 3 or 4 states had any item about government documents on the 50 state forms I studied in the earlier project (1983-84).

3. There are only 1400 depository libraries and 2/3 are in academic libraries.

What do you think? Have any of you had reaction from librians in your state?

C. Population of legal service area. When I suggested that the Public Library Development Project (PLDP) use our definition the suggestion was accepted but with one change. Several members of PLA's New Standards Task Force believe we should include the population of "any areas served by contract "only if those areas have no other library service--i.e. the reporting library is the only library that has a contract with the area. Not to be counted is the population of areas where the reporting library provided supplemental service. For the PLDP, therefore, the definition will end as follows: "plus any area served by contract which are not also served by any ? library." Should the Cooperative System use that addition in the future.

D. Maintenance of effort. Our instructions tell libraries NOT to count employee benefit expenditures if not paid from the library budget (Item 21). Also the instructions say to include salaries of plant operation and maintenance staff only "if paid from library budget." (Item 31) Our rationale for this is that we want to know what the library spends but are not also concerned with what is spent on the library by others. But in Oklahoma libraries are encouraged to count those funds as part of local maintenance of effort for state aid purposes. Oklahoma can easily ask libraries to report two figures but I wonder how other states deal with this.

E. Systems. To what extent will system services distort summary statistics? For example, if a library serving 25,000 people has an annual expenditure of $100,000 and gets $25,000 worth of system support (not shown in our statistics) won't that distort the range, mean and median expenditures for libraries in that size or range? I don't think we can solve this, but I would be interested in your ideas?

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

85-3073k

August 28, 1987

To: Participants
Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Update, August 1987

1. Meeting of participants and potential participants at San Francisco Annual Conference.

   - One or more representatives from twelve states attended the meeting--nine from states committed to sending FY86 data to CES; (Florida, Oklahoma, Washington, Idaho, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Utah, South Carolina and Washington); three from states considering joining for FY87 data (Connecticut, Rhode Island, Wisconsin).

   - A single page "Pilot Project Summary, June, 1987," was distributed (copy attached).

   - Mary Jo Lynch summarized the origin of the pilot project and what has been done to date. Lynch announced that the pilot has been extended twice and is now scheduled to end August 30, 1987. An unsolicited proposal for the first year of an "Expansion Phase" based on the pilot will be submitted with the final report. A major component of the proposal will be support for a Preconference in New Orleans.

   - Each of the states participating in the system for FY86 described the current status of data collection in the state and commented on the process of implementation. A number of states reported that data was/would be sent to CES later than had been anticipated because state agency staff were taking special care to be sure that libraries provided accurate data. (Good idea!)

2. The pilot project Advisory Committee met in San Francisco. Major business was to discuss draft proposal for Year One of an Expansion Phase for the system.

3. Staff at CES have transferred data from disks sent by four states (California, Oregon, Utah, South Carolina) to their mainframe and completed a limited amount of exploratory data analysis. So far so good. Data from Ohio is also at CES.

4. It is important that you FOLLOW THE MODEL RECORD layout in all matters except those noted in 5 below. Otherwise, CES needs to write a special program to transfer your data to the mainframe.

5. Because of suggestions from several early states, we are simplifying specifications for the record layout as follows:

   a. Regarding instruction that "missing items will be coded with 9's the width of the field." Three early states told us this was inefficient and unnecessary. It was originally done so that CES would know a blank was intentional (i.e. no data available) and not just a mistake (e.g., something interrupted the data entry person). If people find it burdensome, however, it is a refinement we can't afford! After discussing the matter with Sam Peng (CES), Richard Palmer (Ohio) and others we have decided to delete the instruction. Therefore, if an item is missing on a library's form, leave the spaces blank.

   b. Regarding instruction to indicate that a value is real(1) or estimate(2). Again, this was done to achieve quality control on the data, but people have objected to the burden. Therefore, CES will assume the values are real (or as close as reasonably possible) if a state sends them. Ones(1) and twos(2) are not needed, but leave the space in the field for now. Ohio will revise the Lotus format for 1987 to accommodate these changes and others in the March 6, 1987 list of items. The revision will be sent to you shortly.

   IF YOU HAVE ALREADY PREPARED YOUR DATA FOR CES USING THE 9'S FOR MISSING DATA AND 1's AND 2's THAT IS OK. DON'T REDO THE DATA.

   In any case, send a cover memo to CES telling them what you have done about these two matters and about anything else that might make your data different from data sent by other states.

6. When your data tape or disk is ready, please send it to:

   Samuel Peng, Director
   Postsecondary Education Statistics Division
   Center for Education Statistics
   U. S. Department of Education
   555 New Jersey Avenue NW
   Washington, DC 20208-1404

   At the same time, please let me know you have sent it.

7. Potential Participants. "The Pilot Project Summary, June, 1987" lists 15 states that have sent or will send FY86 data to CES. The following states have indicated a interest in joining at some in the future: Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia and Wisconsin. All are receiving copies of this memo.

8. We have just learned that Larry Lamour has been assigned to coordinate all library statistics in the various Divisions of CES. He is very interested in this project and has begun to transfer state data to the CES mainframe and work with it. Please send your data ASAP! Larry wants to issue a preliminary report with as many states as possible.

9. If you have any questions or suggestions please write, call me on the 800 line (800-545-2433) or send a message to ALANET 0073.

MJL/vs

cc: Yvonne Carter
Samuel Peng
Advisory Committee
States interested in future participation (Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin)

Attachment #16

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

To:Yvonne Carter
Samuel Peng

May 12, 1987

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Status of 86 public library statistics from states

Since the CES/NCLIS Update on library statistics will take place on May 13th I thought it would be a good idea if I gave you a status report on the progress states have made in reporting FY86 data to CES in machine-readable form.

As you know we had 17 states in the pilot. One (Iowa) had to drop out because of computer problems. Another (Alaska) had to drop out because of personnel cuts in the agency. Both plan to come in again for 1987. Of the 15 remaining (32% of 50), 10 estimated that they would send FY86 data by June 87. Those 15 states are listed below in order by the date they originally estimated they would send data to CES.

10/86 South Carolina: data now at CES
Oklahoma: data will be there in mid-July
11/86 Oregon: data will be there within a month
12/86 California: data will be there within a week (delay because California was not able to provide data in IBM compatible format. Consultant to OFR had his assistant rekey data)

1/87 Wyoming: uncertain, new person in charge of statistics
3/87 Idaho:data will be there in July (delay because of expanded effort to correct inaccuracies)
4/87 Ohio:data will be there "in one month" (delay because new funding formula made extensive verification necessary)
5/87 Indiana: will be there by the end of June (delay because of personnel change)
6/87 Colorado: will be on time
Utah: will be there in a few days

I did not check with the remaining 5 states which estimated data would be sent to CES from July 87 through October 87 since it may be too soon for them to know if they will be on schedule.

You might also be interested to know that I have heard from several states in response to my letter inviting additional participants in FY87 data collection. Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York have indicated interest and are talking with me about any problems they anticipate. Maryland has called me earlier for information about participation. Texas has been talking to us all along and will probably join in 87. Alaska and Iowa will come back. If all goes well, then, we should have 22 states in 1987--44% of the 50 states.

cc: Advisory Committee

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

Cooperative System For Public Library Data Collection
Pilot Project
Advisory Committee Meeting
November 7-8, 1985

AGENDA

1. Introduction
   Announcements
   Recent Changes at NCES, Now CS

2. The States
   Annual Public Library Data Collection in the 50 States-chart
   Annual Data Collection in the 50 States-hand tally
   Letter of invitation
   Volunteer Form

3. The Pilot
   Volunteers for Cooperative Data Collection Project
   Volunteers by region of the U.S.
   Polite refusals
   Special Cases: Idaho, Indiana
   Participation by Level
   Letter to participants
   Reporting to CS
   Publication of results

4. The National System
   a. What the CS expects
      1) Timing
      2) Quality Control
         -eye balling
         -machine edits
   b. How to make it happen -see "Questions for Discussion on Nov.8, 1985"

5. The form - see Mary Jo 's memos of 10/24 and 11/01

6. The Workshop

   -Forms design
   -Quality Control
   -What CS needs
   -How technology can help

7. Communication
   Initial press release
   Press release with names of states in pilot
   Groups at midwinter
      COSLA (Wes)
      ASCLA
      LAMA (Jan)
      PLA

8. Time for meeting at Midwinter

Items distributed:

*Before 11/7

-"Questions for Discussions on November 8" sent with letter to Advisory Committee on 10/04
-"Questions related to proposed items and definitions" dated 10/24/85

*On 11/7

1. Organization charts-OERI, CS
2. Press release (Initial) ✓
3. Annual Public Library Data Collection in the 50 States-chart ✓
4. Annual Data Collection in the 50 States-hand tally
5. Letter of invitation
6. Volunteer form
7. Volunteers for Cooperative Data Collection Pilot Project
8. List of participants by region ✓
9. Letter from Ann Joslin re Idaho
10. Draft letter to Sam Peng re:Indiana data collection ✓
11. Participants by level of participation ✓
12. Draft letter to participants
13."Jurisdiction Population/Population of Area Served" with 2 attachments, dated Nov. 1.

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

48-1894

draft 11-10-85 mjl

To: Advisory Committee
Cooperative Data Collection Project

From: Mary Jo Lynch mjl

Subject: Meeting on November 7 and 8, 1985

Thank you VERY MUCH for your participation in this meeting. I learned a lot, enjoyed your company, and received the direction I needed for the project. The enclosed list of data items and instructions have been revised to incorporate agreed-upon changes. Please contact me AS SOON AS POSSIBLE by phone or by mail (I am ALA0073) if you see anything here which is not what you think it should be. Please try to contact me before noon on Thursday, November 14th. From that time until 4 on Friday, November 15th I will be involved in meetings. If I don't hear from you before Monday, November 18th I will call you then. Once I talk to all of you I will set up a conference call if necessary.

There are several things on the list of data items and instructions which may surprise you:

1. I removed all references to NCES and anything which made it seem as if we were suggesting a form to be used in requesting data from libraries. That should help to make it clear that we are specifying items to be used on state forms so that the data will be available for comparisons from state to state and for national reporting.

2. I used the phrase "population of legal service area" which comes from the Z39 standard for library statistics and also used the definition given by Z39. We talked about using "jurisdiction population" as given in Output Measures for Public Libraries but I really think what I used is more consistent with what we were saying we wanted.

3. I did not remove the word "usual" from the definition of librarian. I think we should stick with what we had which is the definition used in OLPR's Library Education and Personel Utilization statement and the definition in the Z39 standard. Omitting the word "usual" gets us into problems with degrees from schools that were accredited but are not at the time of reporting or with schools that were not accredited when the degree was awarded but are accredited now. Not worth the trouble. Insisting on the usual requirement is a strong statement and I think it is enough. Hope you agree????

4. I changed "fringe benefits" to employee benefits. My colleagues in OLPR tell me that "fringe benefits" is an outdated term.

5. I added little bits to the definitions to clarify what is wanted for Part V (Collections) See if you can find them and if they are OK.

That's it for the data items and definitions which I think we should settle first. I thought it would also be a good idea if I summarized the other decisions we made last week. Your comments on them are also welcome.

1. We are specifying data items and definitions for incorporation in state forms. A state form may very well request more data from libraries but only this data need be reported nationally.

2. Each state library agency is responsible for the quality of the data from libraries which it reports nationally. The Center for Statistics will perform some checks on the data but state library agencies should "eyeball" what is reported to them before passing it on and perform machine edits if possible.

3. States will report data for each library in the state. A paper report is acceptable;machine-readable reports are preferrable. The Center for Statistics uses IBM equipment but handle comp]atibility problems.

4. Data for a single fiscal year is wanted. States will collect this data at different times because state fiscal years differ. In many states the FY is from July 1 to June 30 and statistics for the year are collected in the summer but other states have different cycles. We want a national report on data for a fiscal year not data collected at one point in time but covering different fiscal years.

5. The decision given in 4 above has the following implications for the pilot project. Levels of participation should be as follows:

Level 1. States that can incorporate CS items immediately for collecting FY 85 data in early 1986. States tentatively in this group are: Indiana, Colorado, Minnesota, Oregon, Utah, Washington.These states will be pretesting the items and definitions but their data will not be incorporated into the report of the pilot project which will include FY 1986 data. (Wes Doak may be able to produce an aggregate report of 1985 data for those states.)

Level 2. States that can incorporate CS items for collection of FY 86 data in July or August, 1986. I will need to contact the states in this category on my draft list to find out if this is what they can really do. (Already several states on my draft have been moved to other levels because members of the committee are aware of what was decided about in point 1 above (e.g. Florida moved to 3, Oregon moved to 1).

Level 3: States able to incorporate CS items in Fall 1986 for collection of 1986 data in early 1987. Possibly Idaho, Ohio, Utah.

6. Arrangements should be made so that as many states as possible can asked to participate in some way. States which are not participating in this pilot should be kept informed of what is happening.

7. Timely production of a useful product is essential to the success of a cooperative system. This will be somewhat difficult given the differences in fiscal years but something must be done to make it possible.

8. Press releases on the project should stress that the project will lead to: reduction of paperwork and respondent burden, comparability of data, statistics to make the voices requesting state and federal funding more coherent, timely data.

As soon as I get this off to you I will ask Conference Arrangements for meeting room and time in New York so that we can keep participants and others informed. Also, I will work on a letter to volunteer states giving them more detail on our plan for the project. Will share this with you before I send it out. After we get the data items and definitions settled my next steps will be: 1) get lots of copies made (but not on blue paper) 2) send a letter to volunteer states enclosing the data items and definitions, 3) plan the workshop, 4) draft some suggestions about the product we cant from the CS for your consideration at Midwinter.

MIDWINTER MEETING: tentative plans are to meet for lunch in Roger Parent's suite on Tuesdsay. Feasibility of this plan will depend on where the suite is in relation to where people have to be before and after lunch. More on this when the next schedule is out. Topics for discussion: update, what we want in the product of the pilot study.

cc: Yvonne Carter
Gerald Malitz

P.S. Please send Travel Expense Forms

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

57-2031

January 30, 1986

To: Advisory Committee
Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection Pilot Project

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: "Minutes" of meeting at Midwinter, 1986

Present: Jan Feye-Stukas
Amy Owen
Pat Smith
Virginia Griggs (for Barratt Wilkins)

Yvonne Carter
Mary Jo Lynch

Topics and discussion*:

I. Workshop on March 13/14

There was general agreement that the five topics suggested in MJL's memo of January 9th were very appropriate. The following changes were suggested: 1) move C to the end, add a section on Validation/verification, begin with an introduction to the project. A revised outline of workshop content is given below. Suggestions made for content of each section are given as appropriate.

A. The Pilot Project.

Comment: Cover such questions as : Why it was initiated? What it hopes to accomplish? What is happening now? What will happen in the future?)

B. Integration of items and instructions into existing forms

Comment: good to have examples from level 1 states(who have already integrated the national data items and instructions into existing form) of old form and new form.

C. Redesign of forms(graphics perspective., data entry perspective)

Comment: again good to have examples of old form/new form. Might also be good as lab session with participants suggesting ways to improve each other's forms. Good to plan this ahead with groups of similar states asked to share forms before the workshop. Group by size of population and/or number of libraries.

D. Persuading librarians to respond fully and quickly

Comment: good to encourage sharing of techniques that work (e.g. cover letters, announcements in print and at meetings, working with state consultants.

E. Using computers to manage data collection and reporting

Comment: good to have someone from the Center for Statistics

*Special note to those present: If you think I missed anything important please let me know ASAP.

F. Validation/verificaton of data.

Comment: those present mentioned different methods, e.g. having consultants verify data (Utah, Minn.), machine edits (Texas). Also noted was problem of keeping good will of respondents.

G. Procedures for reporting to the Center for Statistics

Format of workshop: general agreement that program should be about 1/2 presentation of information and 1/2 sharing of participant experience.

II. Specifications for report of FY 86 data from Center for Statistics

The group looked at population ranges used throughout the 1982 report and agreed that population served ranges should be somewhat different. More ranges needed at smaller end (e.g. 1-4,999, 5,000-9,999) and fewer at top (e.g. highest two might be combined). This matter will be discussed again and discussed with others at the USED and at ALA (PLA, LAMA)

III. Other matters

A. Publicity.

After the workshop we need publicity of two types:

1. Articles in ALA's divisional newsletters. Amy will write for ASCLA's Interface, Jan will write for LAMA Newsletter, MJL will write for Public Libraries. All will try to reserve space for issue that comes out before Annual Conference so that people will know about the project before New York. We will probably collaborate on our prose.

2. Letter to all state librarians telling them what is happening, inviting them to join the pilot project if they wish, and asking for the name of the person in charge of statistics.

3. Press release through ALA's PIO.

4. Update at COSLA in April- is this a job for Wes Doak?

B. Meeting in New York. MJL was not sure of the time but will send message to all via ALANET or phone. Will include this information in mailing to participants about the workshop so they can plan to be present and to publicity and letters sent to others after the workshop.

UPDATE: two meetings have been scheduled for Annual Conference

OPEN MEETING FOR PARTICIPANTS AND OTHERS: Saturday 6/28 11:30-12:30

Business lunch for Advisory Committee: Monday 6/30 12:30-2

N.B Memo of January 7th from MJL to several groups re:"Two Projects Related to Public Library Statistics " was distributed at 2 p.m. when all had left except Amy and Jan. Copies are included for everyone else.

cc: Yvonne Carter
Gerald Malitz

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

65-2426

July 24, 1986

To: Advisory Committee
Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Summary of meeting at Annual Conference

Once again my thanks to you for a most productive meeting. Discussion and decisions are summarized below following the outline of my memo to you of June 24, 1986 on "Statistical report from pilot states". Please let me know ASAP if you think I misinterpreted anything or if you disagree with the reported consensus.

1. Re: Summary tables (as table 5 from the 1981-82 report which was attached to my memo). Yes these are useful even with only 17 states and should be here in any case since the report of the 17 should be a model of what we hope to be able to report eventually for all 50 states.

2. Re: Detailed tables (for libraries serving populations of over 100,000). Not necessary for any population served range. Detailed data should be made available on floppy disks which are sold at a reasonable price. Maybe one disk for each geographical area or for libraries serving a particular population range. The disks should contain enough programming that simple searching is possible and should be compatible with major software for those who want to do more analysis.

3. Re: Aggregate tables
a. Rows
1) Ranges of population served. You want more ranges. The following would be useful:

1-999	25,000-49,000
1,000-2,499	50,000-99,999
2,500-4,999	100,000-249,999
5,000-9,999	250,000-499,000
10,000-24,999	500,000 and over

2) Urban, Suburban, Rural. Yes this breakdown is useful. Data on geographic regions should also be available from the floppy disks described above.

b. Columns

1) topics: you didn't comment on my notes here. Assume you want all numbered lines on the Items list summarized in some logical way.

2) Mathematical expression: you want simple summary statistics like totals, frequencies, percentages and mean, median, range. Tables like 12 and 14 from the 1981-82 survey are useful but you do not want percentiles as in table 1.18 from the 1982 College and University survey which was attached to my memo of June 24th.

Additional matters

1. Attached is a copy of a letter from Shay Baker which offers suggestions on the multi-state report. If you have comments please write or call or use on ALANET to ALA 0073.

2. I was reviewing the budget to see what was left and realized I had planned to give each of you a $150 honorarium--a small offering for a big amount of help! I know employees in some states cannot accept honoraria and I would like to know that now so I can plan to spend whatever is left. Please return the bottom of this sheet ASAP.

3. In a few days you will receive a copy of a memo to participating states. Please consider some of the issues in that memo and let me know what you think.

cc: Yvonne Carter, Gerald Malitz

Attachment(1)

Cooperative System Project
Advisory Committee Honorarium

Check should be made out to:

Check should be mailed to the following address:

I cannot accept an honorarium _____.
Signature

OFFICE FOR RESEARCH

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944-6780

85-3073k

August 21, 1987

To: Advisory Committee
Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection

From: Mary Jo Lynch

Subject: Meeting in San Francisco

Present: Wes Doak, Jan Feye-Stukas, Virginia Grigg (for Barratt Wilkins), Amy Owen, Pat Smith

Once again, my thanks for your advice and support. For the record we discussed:

1. Purpose of the Cooperative System. Wes noted that the purpose of the System is more than just production aggregate report. We should also note the value of the database that contains comparable state data in a useful form. Eventually, the system would give machine-readable data to states for their own use. Mary Jo Lynch noted another benefit: state agencies have reported that they are paying much more attention to the quality of the data now that it is going to CES. Therefore, state data will be better.

2. Proposal for Expansion Phase. Several suggestions were made including:
   - number of attendees should be about 40 with a mix of states already participating and states considering participation.
   - plan special subset of the program for new states.
   - distribute a list of hardware and software in use and allow time for "user groups' to meet.

3. State support to systems and system support to libraries.

Joe Schubert of New York is concerned that the Cooperative System will collect data only from units that serve the public directly. Since much state aid in New York goes to system headquarters, any total of state aid in New York would distort reality if it does not include those figures. Although state totals are not the purpose of the Cooperative System, it is possible that the data could be used to produce such totals which would be inaccurate.

The problem is related to another one raised earlier in Advisory Committee discussions--because libraries vary in the amount of system support received, it is not always valid to compare libraries that have the same expenditure levels. Resolution for now: the aggregate report must have a preface that notes the existence of various levels of subsidized system support in addition to the operating expenditures of individual libraries.

4. Aggregate reports. Wes Doak believes we should not wait until all states have reported to start producing reports. He volunteered to work with FY86 data from the four states that have already sent data to CES.

At the moment I am busy putting the finishing touches on a final report of the pilot project, due August 30. A copy will be sent to you. Once that is done, I will complete the Unsolicited Proposal and send it to Washington. I will keep you posted on results.

MJL/vs

cc: Yvonne Carter, Samuel Peng

News Release: American Library Association

Public Information Office
American Library Association
) East Huron Street
hicago, Illinois 60611
312 944-6780

From: Deborah G. Robertson, Officer
Linda K. Wallace, Director
Public Information Office
312/944-6780

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

October 1985

ALA OFFICE FOR RESEARCH TO STUDY COOPERATIVE PUBLIC LIBRARY DATA COLLECTION

The American Library Association (ALA) Office for Research (OFR) has been awarded a $54,400 contract by the U.S. Department of Education for a pilot study to establish groundwork for a cooperative system of public library data collection.

The pilot project will build on OFR's 1984 report to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which recommended that NCES improve its collection and reporting of public library statistics by working with state library agencies to coordinate their annual collection of statistics from public libraries. The Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA) supported the concept at their October 1984 meeting in Burlington, Vt.

All 50 state library agencies have been invited to apply for participation in the project. Seven will be selected for full participation, which involves critique of the latest NCES questionnaire in relation to state needs, working with OFR to solve identified problems, participation in a March 1986 workshop and data collection in June or July of 1986.

- more -

ALA OFFICE FOR RESEARCH TO STUDY DATA COLLECTION --add one

Mary Jo Lynch, director of ALA's Office for Research is principal investigator. Serving on the Advisory Committee are Wes Doak (Oregon State Librarian), Jan Feye-Stukas (Minnesota Office of Public Libraries and Interlibrary Cooperation), Amy Owen (Deputy State Librarian, Utah), Patricia Smith (Texas State Library), Barratt Wilkins (Florida State Library). The advisory committee will choose the seven participating states in November.

- 30 -

American Library Association
Public Information Office
50 E. Huron St.
Chicago, IL 60611
312/944-6780

News

For Immediate Release
March 1986

From: Deborah G. Robertson
Linda K. Wallace
312/944-6780

Workshop on Data Collection Project Held: Open Meeting Planned

An open meeting for participants in the Cooperative Public Library Data Collection System and interested others will be held at the American Library Association Annual Conference on Saturday, June 28, from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Representatives from 14 of the 19 participating state library agencies recently met in Chicago for a training workshop. The pilot project, funded by the U.S. Department of Education and managed by the American Library Association, is the first step in coordinating the annual collection of statistics for public libraries done by state library agencies with the periodic reporting of public library statistics by the Center for Statistics.

"When implemented nationally, long-range benefits of the program will include increased consistency among states in collecting public library statistics and more timely publication of public library statistics," said Mary Jo Lynch, principal investigator for the project and director of the ALA Office for Research.

- more -

Workshop on Data Collection Project Held; Open Meeting Planned--add one

Workshop participants reviewed national data elements and their definitions and discussed strategies for integrating national data elements into existing state forms. Designing forms, using computers to manage data collection and reporting, validating data and procedures for reporting to the Center for Statistics were also discussed.

The pilot project will result in a report of FY 86 data from participating states: Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

- 30 -

64-2311

Use of Population Served Figures in 1983 State Forms and Reports: Summary

Note: This summary is based on a file gathered in the fall of 1983. Changes may have taken place since then. However, it does show the variety of practices which exist with regard to this important factor in describing public libraries.

I. Forms

We have forms of all states except Colorado

26 States include population served figure on form. Of these 26, 22 states require that each library supply this figure. 4 states require that the state library supply this figure. Tables one and two show the breakdown of sources used for these two categories.

Table 1: Sources used by libraries that supply the population served figure.

# of states	Source
8	1980 Census
5	1980 Census & State agency or local source
5	state agency only
1	state agency and local source
3	unclear how figure is derived
22	

Table 2: Sources used by state libraries that supply population served figure.

# of states	Source
2	1980 Census (Mass., Miss.)
1	1980 Census & State agency or local Source (Louisiana)
1	State agency only (N.H.)
4	

II. Reports

We have the reports of all states except Arkansas and Oregon. Hawaii is the only state to omit population served figure from both the form and report. Colorado is omitted from the following table because OFR does not have the form. (However, Colorado's report indicates that Colorado uses a state agency to determine the population served figure included in the report.)

Of the remaining 46 states, 20 did not include a space for a population served figure on the form, but did include it on the report.

Table 3 shows the breakdown of sources used in these reports.

Table 3: Sources used by states that omit population served figure in form, but include it in report.

# of States	Source
12	1980 Census
1	1980 Census & State or local source
4	State agency only
3	Unclear how figure is derived
20	

Table 4: Summary of sources used in state forms and reports

# of States	Source
22	1980 Census
7	1980 Census & State agency or local source
10	State agency only
1	State and local source
6	Unclear how figure is derived
46	

States omitted from Table 4

Arkansas: report not available
Colorado: form not available
Hawaii: population served figure omitted from both form and report
Oregon: Report not available

April, 1986
Richard Giambrone

Use Of Population Served Figures In 1983 State Forms and Reports

State	Form	Report	Source				Comments
			1980 Census	State Agency	Local Source	Unknown	
Alabama	No	Yes	*				Report: Figs. for area legally served by library.
Alaska	Yes	Yes	*		*		Report: Figs. based on reports from library. When no figs. given, latest census figs. are used.
Arizona	No	Yes	*	*			Report: Figs based on 1980 census, unless community was too small to be counted. In such a case, figs. based on State Agency 1980 estimate County Population: 1. Includes pop. of cities in county with public libraries. 2. Fig. immediately following county is pop. in areas unserved by local public library. 3. County pecapita figs. based on unserved pop. plus served pop.
Arkansas	No	NA					
California	Yes	Yes		*			Form: Fig. estimated if no actual info. available. Report: Figs. equal number of persons served and taxed for library support. No person counted twice and credited to more than one library. County Population: Many figs. do not include entire pop. since the county may contain cities or districts supplying independent service. (Exceptions noted p. 12 of report.)

Use Of Population Served Figures In 1983 State Forms and Reports

State	Form	Report	Source				Comments
			1980 Census	State Agency	Local Source	Unknown	
Illinois	Yes	Yes	*		*		Report: Figs. based on Pop. "residing in tax base area." Census figs. used except for district libraries which provide own figs. Report does not indicate how districts derive these figs.
Indiana	Yes	Yes				*	Not clear how fig. is derived
Iowa	No	Yes	*				Report: County Population: Figs. equal pop. served, not total pop. of county
Kansas	No	Yes				*	Not clear how fig. is derived
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	*				Report: Figs. based on service area
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	*	*			Form: State supplied Report: Municipal and parish libraries give own pop. served figs. A municipal lib. within a parish gives only pop. served in municipality estimated figs. from State Agency
Maine	Yes	Yes	*				
Maryland	Yes	Yes		*			Report: Figs. based on jurisdiction served as defined by state for state aid formula
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	*				Form: State supplied Report: No figures for individual libraries. Libraries are divided into pop. groups

Use Of Population Served Figures In 1983 State Forms and Reports

State	Form	Report	Source				Comments
			1980 Census	State Agency	Local Source	Unknown	
Michigan	Yes	Yes				*	Form: Given only if applying for state aid. Report: No figs. for individual libraries. Libraries are divided into pop. groups.
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	*				
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	*				Form: State supplied
Missouri	Yes	Yes				*	Not clear how fig. is derived
Montana	No	Yes	*				
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	*	*			Report: Figs. from "official census" either Federal or State
Nevada	No	Yes	*				
N. Hampshire	Yes	Yes		*			Form: State supplied
New Jersey	No	Yes		*			Report: 1982 est. County Population Figs. includes pop. of all municipalities which provide tax support, including pops. of member libraries listed below county library entry.
New Mexico	No	Yes	*				

Use Of Population Served Figures In 1983 State Forms and Reports

State	Form	Report	Source				Comments
			1980 Census	State Agency	Local Source	Unknown	
N.Y.	Yes	Yes	*				
N. Carolina	No	Yes		*			Report: 1981 permanent resident pop.
N. Dakota	Yes	Yes	*	*			Report: 1980 Census, or latest official census
Okalahoma	No	Yes	*				
Ohio	No	Yes	*				
Oregon	No	NA					
Penn.	Yes	Yes		*			Report: Figs. based on annual state projection. Library systems: figs. equal pop. "which has predominate access to the library." County Population: 1) Counties with overlapping service areas use county pop. figures from 1982 if pop. served is greater than actual pop. 2) County libraries: The pop. served equals total pop. minus the pop. served by other libraries.
Rhode Island	Yes	Implied	*				Report: Per capita appropriations are listed but pop. fig. is not given.
S. Carolina	No	Yes	*				

Use Of Population Served Figures In 1983 State Forms and Reports

State	Form	Report	Source				Comments
			1980 Census	State Agency	Local Source	Unknown	
S. Dakota	Yes	Yes	*				Report: Figs. include chartered or contracted service.
Tenn.	No	Yes	*				
Texas	No	Yes				*	Report: 1982, pop. figs. given Not indicated how derived.
Utah	Yes	Yes	*				
Vermont	No	Yes	*				
Virginia	No	Yes	*				
Washington	Yes	Yes		*			Report: Figs. are for pop. of legal area (including contract cities and towns).
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	*				
Wisconsin	No	Yes		*			Report: State agency estimates
Wyoming	No	Yes				*	Form: No total fig. given. Broken down by category: a) Outreach stations b) books by mail c) bookmobiles Report: Not clear how fig. is derived

52-1913

April, 1986
Richard Giambrone

8-42

University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Graduate School of Library and Information Science
410 David Kinley Hall
1407 West Gregory Drive
Urbana
Illinois 61801

Library Research Center
217 333-1980

Attachment #25

November 13, 1986

Dr. Mary Jo Lynch
Director
ALA Office for Research
American Library Association
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Dr. Lynch:

Your request of October 16, 1986 to Dr. Goldhor for a list of the year that states began publishing statistics collected from public libraries was given to me. I searched library serials for ten states in the University of Illinois libraries for this information.

After looking through issues of state library publications, I surmise that the publication of public library statistics begins more on an informal basis rather than a formal one. Often no announcement is made; nor is there a volume number. This becomes a problem when one is trying to identify the beginning of such a compilation. Another factor is that, of this sample of ten states, the U. of I. does not hold complete runs of state library serials that contain public library statistics. Therefore, the attached list gives the name of the publication and the date of the earliest issue at the U. of I.

Because of this incompleteness of holdings, I would recommend that either your office or the Library Research Center conduct a mail survey to state libraries asking for verification of publication of this material. I would suggest a request for a photocopy of the first two pages of said statistics to see their format and scope.

The current edition of library serials publishing public library statistics usually have LC/OCLC numbers different from their previous incarnation e.g. California Library Statistics and Directory replaced News Notes of California Libraries in 1976. The collection of this information would require some additional time.

The work on this request required four hours of LIS time at a cost of $20/hr.

Please call or write if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Chris Jocius

Chris Jocius
Research Assistant

cj:se

STATE	TITLE OF STATE LIBRARY PUBLICATION WITH PUBLIC LIBRARY STATISTICS WITH DATE OF EARLIEST UI HOLDING
AL ɜAMA	STATISTICAL REPORT OF ALABAMA PUBLIC LIBRARIES: UI 1954-55
ALASKA	ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF ALASKA: UI 1960-61
AR ƶONA	ARIZONA PUBLIC LIBRARY STATISTICAL REPORT & DIRECTORY: UI 1972-73
ARKANSAS	ARKANSAS LIBRARIES: UI 1930
CA IFORNIA	NEWS NOTES OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARIES (WINTER ISSUE): UI 1921 (v.16)
CO ɔRADO	COLORADO STATE LIBRARY BIENNIAL REPORT: UI 1956
FLORIDA	FLORIDA LIBRARY DIRECTORY AND STATISTICS: UI 1950-51
GE ʀGIA	GEORGIA PUBLIC LIBRARY STATISTICS: UI 1946
HAWAII	ANNUAL REPORT--OFFICE OF LIBRARY SERVICES: UI 1962-63
ID ɨO	BIEENIAL REPORT OF THE STATE LIBRARY: UI 1903-04

64-2365k

Cooperative System for Public Library Data Collection: Pilot Project Summary, June 1987

What is the purpose of the pilot project?

To explore the feasibility of a system which coordinates the annual collection of data from public libraries in the 50 states with the periodic reporting of national statistics on public libraries by the USDE.

Who is involved?

Financial support: USDE Library Programs Office and Center for Education Statistics.

Advisory committee: Wes Doak, Jan Feye-Stukas, Amy Owen, Patricia Smith, Barratt Wilkins

Principal Investigator: Mary Jo Lynch, ALA Office for Research

Participants: State libraries of California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, Wyoming

When did it start? October 1, 1985

What has happened since then?

All 50 states invited to participate. Over 20 responded, but some have had to drop out. March 1986 Workshop provided participants with technical assistance and an opportunity to revise list of items and instructions to be incorporated into state forms. IBM mainframe record layout for SAS prepared by Indiana State Library. LOTUS 1-2-3 format and template prepared by Ohio State Library. States incorporated cooperative system items and instructions into state forms used to collect FY 86 data. Most states are using an IBM or compatible microcomputer to prepare a disk using LOTUS 1-2-3. Four states have sent FY86 data to CES.

What will happen next?

As each state completes collection of FY86 statistics from public libraries, data will be sent to the Center for Education Statistics for aggregation into a multi-state report.

When will it finish?

Pilot project is currently funded through August 1987 and technical report is due then. Report of FY86 statistics will be published in early 1988. Funding is now being sought to support expansion of the system.

What will be the result of the project?

Short term: technical report, multi-state statistical report
Long term: a cooperative statistical system involving all 50 states

How can I get more information?

Contact Mary Jo Lynch, Director, ALA Office for Research

TABLE 15—Educational Status of Employed Librarians by Type of Library: January 1, 1982 1/

Library Degree or Certificate	Library Type				
	Public	Academic	School	Special	Total
MLS Only	18,520	12,550	22,240	10,770	64,080
MLS Plus Other Graduate Degree	1,130	6,160	5,830	2,300	15,420
MLS, Other Degree Status Unknown	1,120	290	3,370	340	5,120
4-year Bachelor's in Library Science (BLS)	780	250	10,660	380	12,070
5th Year Bachelor's in Library Science (BLS)	200	400	1,720	80	2,400
School Library Certificate	440	130	8,590	110	9,270
Other Library Degree or Certificate	1,010	350	2,890	240	4,490
SUBTOTAL	23,200	20,130	55,300	14,220	112,850
No Library Degree or Certificate					
Graduate Degree	330	540	3,780	1,180	5,830
Bachelor's Degree	2,670	390	4,830	1,920	9,810
Other	6,040	80	2,190	810	9,120
SUBTOTAL	9,040	1,010	10,800	3,910	24,760
Unknown	960	40	1,040	220	2,260
TOTAL	33,200	21,180	67,140	18,350	139,870
Percent with Library Degree or Certification	70	95	82	77	80
Percent without Library Degree or Certification	27	5	16	21	18
Percent Unknown	3	*	2	1	2

* Less than 1 percent.

1/ From NCES/OLLT Library Human Resources Employer Survey, 1982.